

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. CXIII.—JULY, 1863.

## ARTICLE I.—MISSIONS OF THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

[BY REV. A. N. ARNOLD, D. D., WESTBOROUGH, MASS.]

*Memorial Volume of the first Fifty Years of the American Board  
of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Boston. 1861.*

*The Christian Examiner for March, 1862. Article VII.*

*The North American Review for April, 1862. Article IX.*

*The Boston Review for May, 1862. Article III.*

In most human undertakings, half a century of persevering effort is amply sufficient to test their practicability, and to determine with what measure of success any further prosecution of them will be likely to be attended. There are, indeed, great national enterprises, schemes of policy, institutions of government, scientific enterprises, and works of art, which may require even a longer time than this, before they can be properly said to have succeeded, or to have failed; to be practicable, or to be impracticable. And there are some minds inspired with such a lofty enthusiasm that they labor with all the more zeal on a work which they never hope to see completed, or even advanced much nearer to completion, in their own day. So short, however, is human life, and human faith

and patience as well, that works which depend for their continuance upon popular co-operation must be able to show proof of practicability, and evidences of progress, or they will not long be prosecuted with vigor.

What then are the results of fifty years of effort in the missionary work? Are they such as to repay, in any adequate degree, the toils and sacrifices that have been given to it, the treasure that has been expended, the precious lives that have been offered upon this altar? Are they such as to afford any encouragement to the hope that the Christian religion can be extended, by such methods as these, over the whole habitable globe? These are fair questions; they are questions which sensible and practical men will ask; and unless they can be satisfactorily answered, it is easy to foresee that the cause of missions will decline, in spite of any efforts which can be made to sustain it by those who are bound to it by the tie of official position, by the feeling of denominational pride, or by the nobler sentiment of Christian enthusiasm. There is, indeed, a higher and more sacred view of the missionary work,—a view which lifts its obligation and its prospects above all merely human calculations of expediency, balancings of probability, and comparisons of profit and loss, and plants it securely in the precept and purpose and promise of the Most High; and it is by these higher principles that the enterprise must finally be judged,—the last appeal is to the Court of Heaven. Yet we are fully persuaded that it will abide the lower test, that with a fair trial its cause will prevail in the court of earthly judgment, and we shrink not from submitting it to the common and just rule of being judged by its fruits. Yet we are entitled to demand for it deliberate and impartial judgment, and to protest against a hasty, passionate or prejudiced verdict. When a writer, like the reviewer of the *Memorial Volume* in the *Christian Examiner*, declares it to be an error to say that missions to the heathen are obligatory, and a serious mistake to inaugurate them without waiting for a clearly defined good opportunity, he virtually proclaims his own disqualification for the work of criticising them. He pronounces himself beforehand out of all sympa-



thy with this Christian enterprise; and we need not wonder to hear him speaking of the result of half a century of missionary labor as an "unquestioned ill success," a "most ghastly failure."

What, then, in a fair and candid estimate, are the fruits of this half century's work of the earliest and largest of the missionary societies on this continent? During this period the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions received and expended a constantly increasing amount of contributions, beginning with less than one thousand dollars in 1811, and reaching a fraction less than four hundred and thirty thousand in 1860. The total contributions of the half century amounted to more than eight and a half millions of dollars. The board sent out as missionaries and assistant-missionaries to the heathen and semi-heathen of various lands, more than twelve hundred evangelical laborers, including more than four hundred ordained preachers. These missionaries have reduced to writing twenty languages which they found utterly destitute of any literature; they have caused to be printed more than eleven hundred millions of pages of Christian literature, in more than forty different languages or dialects. They had under instruction, at the close of the period, more than ten thousand pupils in Christian schools, and had at an earlier period nearly twice that number. They had gathered into churches, formed on the principle of requiring evidence of conversion of each individual before admission, more than fifty thousand persons whom they believed, upon examination, to have passed from death unto life.

These figures must, of course, from the nature of the case, be a very inadequate expression of the results of such a work. But they are suggestive, to the candid mind, of anything rather than failure. They afford strong encouragement to the expectation that the whole world will ultimately be Christianized. For although what has already been accomplished is but an insignificant item in the great work of universal evangelization, yet it must be remembered that this item is but the work of *one* among more than a score of similar societies engaged in the same work; that this work is but recently

begun, and that, as in all beginnings, much time and labor have been lost in making experiments, and learning wisdom for the future; and that steady development and progress are, in an uncommon degree, the characteristics of the modern missionary enterprise. Already the older missions have become wholly or partially self-supporting, and have begun to send out missionaries to the regions beyond. Indeed, one of the most wonderful things which this *Memorial* of fifty years brings to view, is the remarkably uniform expansion of the work, from the beginning until now. If the whole period be divided into portions of four years each, the receipts for each of these quadrennial periods show an advance upon those of the preceding, with only a solitary exception. If the whole time be divided into five periods of ten years each, the result is similar in all but the exception. The second decade shows a sum total nearly four times larger than the first; the third, nearly three times larger than the second; the fourth, an advance of more than fifty per cent. upon the third; and the fifth, an advance of more than twenty-five per cent. upon the fourth. As the sum total rapidly enlarges, the *ratio* of increase of course diminishes.

But while the receipts of the board have thus been increasing in a remarkably uniform manner, there have been, as in other societies, financial crises and heavy debts. In 1841 the Board found itself burdened with a debt of three or four years' growth, amounting to nearly sixty thousand dollars. The receipts of the year following were nearly seventy thousand dollars greater than in any preceding year. Indeed, the great permanent advances in the receipts of the Board all stand in immediate connection with its larger debts, and would seem to have resulted from the effort to throw them off. This is probably true of other benevolent societies. It seems to be the plan of Divine Providence to make use of such exigencies, as the means of teaching Christian people the practicability and the blessedness of enlarged giving. The result is only what might be expected, allowing that the debts in question are not incurred by any extravagant, injudicious, or unauthorized expenditures on the part of those who have the immediate

management of the pecuniary affairs of these societies. Assuming that they use their powers discreetly, in accordance with the instructions of their constituents, the indebtedness ought not to be an occasion of censure against them, and may prove an occasion, not only of drawing forth larger contributions to meet the immediate exigency, but of securing a permanent increase in the regular receipts of subsequent years. All benevolent enterprises which depend mainly upon voluntary contributions for their support, must be liable to occasional financial difficulties and debts. This is an unavoidable result of the uncertainty of human affairs, and the liability of all communities to periods of commercial depression. It is therefore almost indispensable to the security of benevolent societies, and to the maintenance of their financial credit under such periodical pressures, that they should have some permanent fund, as a resource in any sudden embarrassment. The American Board have felt this necessity, and have provided for it, by the creation of two classes of permanent funds, the one for general purposes, and the other for the salaries of officers. The two combined amount to more than one hundred thousand dollars. We are pleased to see that our own Missionary Union has had the financial ability and wisdom to increase its reserved resources by a considerable appropriation.

The annual receipts of the American Board for the last half of the fifty years, ending with 1860 averaged more than three hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and for the last quarter of this period, nearly three hundred and seventy thousand. As the total receipts increase, the relative cost of agencies is reduced in a rapidly diminishing ratio. In the case of the American Board, it now amounts to only between six and seven per cent. Those who complain of this expenditure, and express so much regret that the heathen should be deprived of the direct benefit of so large a portion of their Christian liberality, have a very obvious recourse. If they would double their contributions, and persuade others to do the same, they would reduce the percentage deducted for agencies by one-half. This is not said to justify or palliate



any want of economy in the management of the pecuniary affairs of our benevolent societies; but we believe that the complaints made on this ground have been in many cases unreasonable, and that while a wholesome vigilance should undoubtedly be exercised over those who are entrusted with the administration of the funds of such societies, the seeming occasion for the complaint might as often and as suitably be removed by a more generous liberality on the part of the contributors, as by a severer economy on the part of the Boards or Committees who are responsible for the use of the moneys contributed. If the annual receipts of our Missionary Union were increased by one hundred thousand dollars, little, if any, additional agency would be required, and consequently the relative cost of agencies would be reduced nearly one-half.

Among the difficult practical questions to which our modern missionary enterprise has given rise, that of providing for superannuated and disabled missionaries, and for missionaries' children, has occupied a large share of attention, and has elicited a diversity of opinion. After two years' deliberate consideration of the subject, the following conclusions were reached at the annual meeting of the Board in Providence, in 1857 :

"1. That it is highly desirable to cherish and to strengthen a warmer Christian sympathy in behalf of those who have been disabled in their work as missionaries, and toward their widows and children ; and that it is desirable to open all suitable channels for the practical expression of such sympathies.

"2. That the Prudential Committee will receive and cheerfully appropriate, according to the same principles which have hitherto governed them in the premises, whatever legacies or contributions may be made from year to year, and designated by their donors for this specific object."

These two resolutions were adopted as substitutes for those proposed by the committee, which had been appointed two years before to report upon this subject. The majority of the committee reported in favor of establishing a separate fund; but the minority presented an able report against this measure. The allowance to the children of missionaries is fixed

by the Board at sixty dollars per year for a boy, and fifty dollars for a girl, until eighteen years of age, if applied for by the parent or guardian. This sum was "not designed to be so large as to interfere with outgoings from the natural fountains which exist in blood relationships, early friendships for the parents, &c., but rather to stimulate their flow." The views developed, and the principles fixed, as the result of the discussion of this subject at several annual meetings of the Board, seem to us eminently just and judicious. "The somewhat peculiar circumstances of this country have of course been considered — the assimilating, absorbing power of society; the constant intermingling of the great social currents; the ease of obtaining employment and self-support; and the almost unhealthful stimulus to activity in all departments of life, often rendering it difficult to retain children long enough under parental guardianship and control; the whole inseparable from the rapidly developing resources of a vast, new country. The leading object is to bring returned missionary children into the great social currents; and this is best secured by giving free scope for the operation of blood relationships and friendships, and for the freest intermixture with native born children in the schools and employments of the parental home and country.

Every human system has its hardships, but the results to the returned children of missions, now a considerable number, have been at least as favorable as with the children of pastors.

Schools and asylums for missionary children have sometimes been urged upon the Board. It is believed that the missionaries would now generally object to them. Some of the best friends of the cause have also been in favor of instituting a permanent fund for superannuated and disabled missionaries, and for the children of missionaries. But it is the opinion of the Board that the existing mode of providing for disabled missionaries and the children of missionaries, is preferable to one which should have a permanent fund for its basis, more simple, more humane, more effective, more in accord-

ance with the social condition and institutions of our country; no more a charity; much less a pension; less liable to perversion; with better effect on missionaries and their children; more accordant with the natural laws under which God places his children; and less likely to interfere with the ordinary receipts of the Board." (Page 279-80.)

Missionaries of the Gospel and their children, wherever born, are not aliens by our law, but stand on the same footing as to citizenship and title to national protection, with families who have never left their native land. It is not likely that christian charity will be less just and merciful than the civil statute, or that the children of faithful missionaries of the cross will ever be regarded or treated by Christian people as aliens from sympathy and charity.

Missionary Societies have now been so long in existence, and the number of missionaries sent out has become so great, that tables of the average duration of missionary life may be made out, having almost the accuracy of those on which our Life Assurance Companies found their calculations. Of one hundred and thirty-four missionaries who had gone from the Andover Theological Seminary up to 1858, the average term of missionary service was about fourteen years. Of the sixty-six who were living at the expiration of this period, the average duration of missionary service was already seventeen years and a half, and was of course growing larger. Fifteen of the entire number were in the missionary field more than thirty years, and two saw forty-two years of service. The average duration of the missionary labor of two hundred and fifty missionaries in India was found to be nearly seventeen years. Many of these returned, and lived many years in their native lands after they left the missionary field. These statistics show that the average probability of life is not greatly reduced by engaging in missionary service. Those who go forth to preach the gospel to the heathen do not by any means devote themselves surely to an early grave,—they may even secure a considerable extension of life by the change of climate.

The loss of life by violence, or by sudden casualty, is ex-



ceedingly rare. Of nearly fifteen hundred persons belonging to the families of missionaries and of the officers and agents of the Board, who have travelled not far from a million of miles, over all continents and seas, and in all climates (one of the Secretaries has travelled considerably over fifty thousand miles), only two have suffered the loss of life by shipwreck—one a missionary in China and one a Secretary of the Board ;—three have died by the hands of savages, while on tours of exploration ; one has been drowned while crossing a river near his own dwelling, and several were massacred in their own homes by the Oregon Indians in 1848.

Among the subjects on which wisdom has been dearly bought, in conducting the missionary work, is that of schools for the children of heathen parents, taught in part by heathen teachers. In the Mahratta Mission, where the number of children taught up to 1860 was twelve thousand, the missionaries say, in their report for the year 1854, “ we cannot point to a single instance of conversion from among all this number.” In the Ceylon Mission, where more than thirty thousand children had been under instruction, about thirty cases of hopeful conversion were all that could be reported in 1855. In both these instances there had been some apparent conversions among the teachers ; but in the latter mission, out of eighty who had joined the church, twenty-five had since shown themselves unworthy members. The results are very different in some of the higher schools, where the scholars are under the exclusive care of Christian teachers. Out of six hundred and seventy, who had been connected with the Batticotta Seminary up to 1855, three hundred and fifty-two were church members. In the Oodooville Female Boarding School, out of rather more than two hundred who had left the institution in 1855, one hundred and seventy-five were members of the church. It was thought in the beginning of these missionary operations, that the common schools with heathen teachers would answer a valuable purpose as nuclei for congregations ; but experience afterwards showed, that wherever congregations could readily be gathered in connection with these schools, they could with almost equal facility be gathered without them.

We find repeated mention, in this *Memorial Volume*, of the catholic and unsectarian basis of the American Board, as a special excellence and recommendation of this particular organization. Dr. Hopkins, in his *Historical Discourse*, enlarges upon this as one of the fundamental principles of the Board, and one of its brightest glories. "Of the two great elements from which this movement originated, and which have pervaded and moulded the whole policy of the Board, . . . the first is a transcendent estimate of what belongs to Christianity in its relation to a future life ; that is, of essential and spiritual Christianity, as compared with modes and forms, and all that in which evangelical Christians have agreed to differ. . . . In virtue of this, our aim has been simple, spiritual, grand ; and we have been guarded, as fully, perhaps, as such an enterprise can be, from sectarianism and ecclesiasticism. . . . What we have done here we have done simply as Christians, and we thank God for the privilege. It has been good for us thus to do it. And what we have thus done, may God give us grace always to do." He confidently predicts, though obliged to confess that present indications are not auspicious, that this principle of the co-operation of different sects in joint missionary labors will be more and more honored. And he aims no ambiguous censure at those whose missionary operations are conducted on stricter and more ecclesiastical principles. "If, indeed, there be any denomination that so claims to be exclusively the true church, that they think others are not competent to administer, or *fitted to receive*, all the ordinances of the church, that denomination must, so far as they thus think, work by itself." We might easily cite other similar claims, from different parts of the volume. The Boston reviewer is very bold on this point, and says of the American Board: "Nearer to the common Master in spirit and in policy, it was born of no particular church, *but of the church*. Like Him it has always been above sects and denominations." We wish to examine this claim, so confidently asserted, first as to its historical truth, and then as to its principle.

From the fourth chapter of the *Memorial Volume* on

“Constitution and Membership,” we learn that the nine original Commissioners were all Congregationalists, and that in the following year three more were added, who were also of the same denomination. Indeed, it is expressly stated in this chapter that “the Board seems to have had no thought of becoming anything more than a Congregational body.” Accordingly at its second meeting, in 1811, it suggested to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church the forming of a similar body in that communion. But when, after deliberate consideration, the General Assembly decided not to form any such organization, the Board was led to extend its membership into the Presbyterian Church; and at the annual meeting in 1812, eight Commissioners were added from among prominent members of that church. In the same manner the membership was afterwards extended into several other denominations. At the time when the *Memorial Volume* was prepared, of the two hundred and five members of the Board, one hundred and five belonged to the Congregational Church, eighty-one to the New School Presbyterian, seventeen to the Old School Presbyterian, nine to the Protestant Dutch Reformed, and two to the Reformed German Church. Three years before this time the Reformed Dutch Church had as a body withdrawn from the American Board, and assumed the management of their own missions, which had formerly been under the supervision of the Board. It was found that the union had not accomplished what was hoped from it, in interesting the entire body of the Reformed Dutch Church in the entire field occupied by the American Board. There were but two missionary fields actually occupied by missionaries of that Church—Arcot, in India, and Amoy in China—and all the interest of this ecclesiastical body in the missionary work, and all the appeals to its members for their co-operation, were limited to these two points, instead of being extended over the whole field included in the Board’s operations. Under these circumstances, the union was found to be an obstacle to the development of the missionary spirit and the missionary resources of the Dutch Reformed Church, and “all parties at length became convinced that the interests of the missionary



cause would be promoted by a different arrangement." The Presbyterian Church, too, which at first judged it inexpedient to engage as an ecclesiastical body in this work, has long had its own missionary organization, although some members of this church still continue to co-operate with the American Board, and the native churches, in some of its mission fields, are still formed according to the Presbyterian polity. This is true of the churches gathered from among the Armenians, and of some in India, and of those among the Choctaw, Dakota, and Ojibwa tribes of our own continent. The mission churches among the Cherokees were at first Presbyterian, but afterwards became Congregational. Among the Nestorians, the ancient Episcopal polity has not been disturbed, the missionaries contenting themselves with preaching the gospel, and seeking to convert souls, and to infuse spiritual life into the old congregations.

The facts then appear to be, that the pre-eminent catholicity claimed for the American Board was not, in the first instance, designed and spontaneous, but the result of circumstances, and the dictate of expediency and convenience ; that it never extended beyond three or four denominations, never including either Episcopalians, Baptists or Methodists ; that it has not worked altogether without friction, either in the organization at home, or in the mission churches ; and that the two principal denominations formerly associated with the Congregationalists in the American Board have each found that an independent denominational organization was much more favorable to the development of missionary zeal, and the collection of missionary funds, among the churches of their own order. We cannot forbear to quote in this connection a generous sentence from the chapter on "Reminiscences." After recording the fact, that Mr. and Mrs. Judson and Mr. Rice had become Baptists, the Rev. Mr. Nott says: " With every conviction of their earnest sincerity, their change was deeply regretted, as a hindrance to our united purpose ; but it must now be acknowledged to have blessed India beyond the Ganges with blessings above all price." As a consequence of the formation of a separate and denominational missionary organization

among the Baptists, made necessary, it seems, in spite of the *catholic basis* of the American Board, by the change of sentiments on the part of these missionaries, the missionary spirit was developed much earlier, more rapidly, and more widely, among the Baptists, than among those denominations, other than Congregational, which continued to use the American Board as the channel of their missionary efforts. There seems little ground, in view of these facts, for the confidence which President Hopkins expresses, that the principle of united action will prevail over that of distinct denominational societies. On the contrary, we do not doubt that the Presbyterians and German Reformed, who still continue in connection with the American Board, will ere long become convinced of the expediency of denominational action, and will follow the example of those who have already withdrawn. And there is, it appears to us, just as little ground for the claim of special catholicity, as there is for the prediction of its prevalence. Why were not Judson and Rice retained as missionaries of the Board, after they became Baptists? If the Board were doing their missionary work, as is claimed, "simply as Christians," and "above sects and denominations," it seems strange that it did not occur to them to say to these missionaries: "the change in your sentiments in regard to baptism will make no difference in regard to your connection with us; our Board is formed on a catholic basis, and we are doing our missionary work simply as Christians, and we mean to keep ourselves always on this high platform, above all sects and denominations." It does not appear that such a generous catholicity as this had any place, at that time, in the hearts or the thoughts of any of the members of the Board. The truth is, that neither Baptists, Episcopalians, nor Methodists, ever had any part or lot in the organization. Baptists are excluded, according to President Hopkins, because they maintain that unbaptized persons are "not fitted to receive," and Episcopalians, because they maintain that unordained persons are "not competent to administer," "all the ordinances of the Church;" and Methodists—it does not appear why. But the basis of a Missionary Society can hardly be called eminently catholic, which ex-

cludes from its fellowship three of the principal evangelical sects, of which one was the *first* to engage in the missionary work, and the other two are now in advance of all other denominations, Congregationalists not excepted, in the extent of their missionary work, the amount of their contributions, and the number of their missionaries in the field. No doubt the American Board is a noble Christian institution, and its members may be men of very enlarged and catholic feelings; but its basis is just so catholic as this and no more, that it is limited to those who are Pedobaptists, Calvinists, believers in the parity of the ministry, and disbelievers in immersion as the only scriptural baptism. The *parings* of this catholic basis are considerably broader, it must be confessed, than the platform which is left.

Thus far we have considered this matter merely in the light of facts and experience. But, apart from the inconsistency of the claim, and the evident inconveniences and disadvantages in the practical working of this extolled catholicity, is the principle itself a sound and scriptural one? Under what commission do our missionaries go forth to preach the gospel to the benighted? Is it under the Divine commission, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations"? If so, must they not take that commission in its fulness and integrity as their directory? Must they not, in connection with preaching the gospel to the heathen and making disciples among them, baptize them also, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and then "teach them to observe *all things* whatsoever" Christ has commanded? Have they a right to curtail this commission, and to say, "I will proceed so far in fulfilling this work, and here I will stop?" Is not the subsequent teaching as imperative as that which is the means of making disciples? And does not that include instruction in regard to the organization of the church, and in regard to its ordinances?

In our view, the catholicity claimed for the American Board would be no ground of boasting, if it were better supported than it is by the facts of the case. We say rather, let those who go forth to teach idolaters, or to revive a pure Christianity in



corrupt churches, go with distinct and positive views on the whole range of christian duties, prepared to train their converts in all that pertains to their individual and ecclesiastical relations, as disciples of Christ, and members of his church. They go to build the house of the Lord in the wilderness. Let them not refuse to explain to their converts the Divine pattern and plan of that house, as well as the materials out of which it is to be constructed. Let them not refuse to explain to their converts any part of the Lord's will in regard to which they may be questioned; nay, let them not wait to be questioned; but under a deep sense of their responsibility to Him, let them teach the converted and baptized disciples *all things* that He has commanded,—all things pertaining to the constitution of his church, its government, and its ordinances. These things are secondary, to be sure, in comparison with conversion, and the salvation of the soul. And so they are in America, as well as in Asia; in the United States, as well as in Persia. If they are so doubtful, or so unimportant, that it is not expedient to say anything about them to converts from among the heathen, then they are not of sufficient consequence to justify the separation of Christians at home into distinct denominations. It is indeed an evil, which deserves to be deeply lamented, that the different questions which divide the Christian world should have to be re-discussed and re-determined in the churches which our various missionary societies are planting among the heathen; but it is an inevitable result of the existence of these differences among the Christians who are engaged in these missionary efforts,—inevitable, unless God had seen fit to confine to some single sect the honor and the labor of missionary service, which would doubtless have been a greater evil; nay, inevitable even on that supposition, for that could only have delayed, not prevented for all future time, the disturbing discussion of these unhappy differences. There seems, then, to be no escape from the evil of introducing denominational differences into the churches founded by missionary labors. It will not do to wait until we have a united Christianity at home, before we begin to engage in these labors; for the

Master's command is imperative, and the evil of sects among Christians is insignificant in comparison with the evils resulting, for time and for eternity, from ignorance of the only religion that can sanctify and save the sinful soul. It will not do to carry to the heathen only so much of Christianity as all sects are agreed in; for that would be wrong in principle and impracticable in fact. It will be found impossible to draw the line of division between catholic essentials and sectarian non-essentials. What shall the translator do, if he must not commit himself on the question of baptism? What shall the pastor of the mission church do, or, if that office be declined out of regard to this principle, what shall the instructor of the future pastors of the mission churches do, when his opinion is asked, or his instructions sought, by those whom he is training for pastoral service, in regard to the scriptural way of baptism, the proper subjects of it, the qualifications for the communion, the scriptural form of church government? Must the literature of the christian world be carefully concealed from the native converts, lest these agitating questions should be suggested to their minds? Nay, that would be a bootless labor, if it were not a grievous wrong,—for those questions would not fail to arise of themselves, only perhaps a little later, if they were not thus suggested from without.

It will not do to put any such fetters upon those servants of the Lord whom we send forth to preach the gospel to the heathen. They must keep back nothing that is profitable for their newly converted brethren; (the Apostle does not say, that he kept back nothing that was *essential*, Acts xx: 20;) they must declare to their converts the whole counsel of God, as they understand it. They must instruct them to the best of their ability, in all the parts of the Lord's will, without presuming to judge for them how much it is best for them to know of the things which are freely revealed by the Lord to his people. To do otherwise would be to sanction the conduct of those Southern tyrants, who have reduced the fulness of Divine revelation to a meagre oral gospel, as sufficient for the poor negro. To do otherwise, would be to act on a principle incompatible alike with purity and peace, with loyalty to

Christ, and with harmony among his people. For all harmony and mutual respect and charity among Christians must be founded in honesty—in the unreserved recognition of the fact that they do differ, and the unhesitating admission of the principle that they have a right, as before each other, to differ,—a right to differ, but not a right to quarrel, or to hate or revile each other.

But this discussion has drifted us away somewhat from the subject of missionary policy, and borne us to the borders of the great questions of Christian liberty and Christian union,—questions which this is not the place to discuss. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has substantial claims to the respect and gratitude of the Christian world, but it may not claim the glory of having successfully solved the problem of conducting Christian Missions on a catholic basis, on which all evangelical Christians can consistently co-operate. As a matter of fact, the solution has not been successful, even within the very partial limits within which the experiment has been confined; and if it had, success in such a compromise of Christian truth (for it could be nothing else) would bring no glory. We remember reading, many years ago, when the Armenian converts were first persecuted, and cast out from the corrupt church of their fathers, the expression of rejoicing, on the part of the missionaries, that they were *now at liberty* to organize their converts into separate churches. We read this expression then with sorrow and surprise, and we are of the same mind still. Those excellent and noble men, how could they persuade themselves that they were not at liberty to form pure and scriptural churches until after a corrupt and unscriptural church had excommunicated and anathematized their converts! The apostles of our Lord, the primitive missionaries, conducted their labors on no such principle of accommodation. Their language is, not only in matters of doctrine: "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed;" but also in matters of form and church order, "so ordain we in all churches," "we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."



What a change has taken place in the moral aspect of the world since the American Board, the earliest of our great missionary organizations, began its beneficent work. Europe, Asia, Africa, America, all are very different now from what they were then. And the difference in all is such as to afford cause for joy and gratitude to every Christian heart. Asia and Africa had only been visited by the first faint streaks of that moral dawn which has now expanded into a broad belt of light across the one continent, and a broad band of light around the other. In Europe and in our own country there was, undoubtedly, then as well as now, much sincere piety; there were many devout, active and accepted servants of God; but the heathen world was sadly and guiltily neglected, and the influence of evangelical religion, in Europe especially, was much less than it is now. How much has been learned, too, from the experience of half a century, in regard to the best modes of missionary labor, in regard to schools, to native assistants and native pastors, and the education best adapted to make them efficient helpers in the missionary work, in regard to the number of missionaries necessary to secure the evangelization of a district or a nation; and, in a word in regard to all the principles, modes, and appliances of missionary labor. And in bringing about this happy change, God has honored our brethren connected with the American Board with a very large and blessed agency. He raised up men of ardent Christian zeal, to begin, so far as this country is concerned, the work of missions, and to lay the foundations in heathen lands, and men of large Christian wisdom and foresight, to devise plans and determine principles for making the missionary organization at home as efficient as possible. And when, on the evening after the Jubilee, the missions of the Board were represented by a gathering, at the house of one of the secretaries, of returned missionaries speaking no less than twenty languages,—more than twice as many, probably, as were spoken by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost,—these servants of the Lord must have felt that He had indeed wrought great results by their means. May He continue to

bless them more and more, with multiplied converts, enlarging fields of labor, and still expanding liberality and zeal.

Our own missionary Jubilee is at hand. Let us celebrate it with grateful joy, for we, too, have abundant occasion to exclaim, "What has God wrought!" Let us prepare for this sacred festival, by liberally enlarging the scale of our regular contributions, so that our Jubilee may indeed be a year of release to all our missions from the restraints with which our want of liberality has bound them. Let us be provoked by the example of our brethren of other denominations, to more bountiful giving; and let us, while we bid a hearty Godspeed to all who are carrying the light of the gospel, according to the measure in which they enjoy it, to the nations that are in darkness, adhere faithfully to the principle which has distinguished us hitherto, of carrying out, wherever our missions are planted, the entire plan of the Christian church, in all the beauty and simplicity of its scriptural polity, and in all the exactness of its positive institutions. And may the Lord, in his own good time, so plentifully pour out his Spirit upon his people in all the continents and in all the islands of the sea, that they shall come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.

## ARTICLE II.—THE MOHAMMEDAN SYSTEM IN ITS RELIGIOUS ASPECTS AND TENDENCY.

[BY REV. G. W. SAMSON, D. D., PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIAN COLLEGE, D. C.]

*(Concluded from page 358.)*

Against the doctrine of Christ's divinity Mohammed reasons and expostulates and denies, as seems best to suit the humor of the hour. Thus in the ivth chapter he exclaims. "Say not, There are three Gods; forbear this; it will be better for you. God is but one God. Far be it from Him that he should have a son. Unto Him belongeth whatever is in heaven and in earth; and God is a sufficient protector. Christ doth not proudly disdain to be a servant unto God." Again (ch. vth) he says: "They are infidels who say, Verily God is Christ the Son of Mary; since Christ said, O children of Israel, serve God, my Lord and your Lord; whosoever shall give a companion unto God, God shall exclude him from Paradise. They certainly are infidels who say, God is the third of three; for there is no God, besides one God, Christ the son of Mary is no more than an apostle." The language thus used by Mohammed would seem more intensely opposed to vital Christianity, were it not for the fact that the corrupt Christianity of his day and land seem to teach that the *three* in the Deity referred to by him were the Father, the Son and *Mary*. This is distinctly brought out in the vi.th chapter, where Mohammed writes: "When God shall say unto Jesus at the last day, O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto men, Take me and my mother for two Gods beside God? he shall answer, Praise be unto Thee! It is not for Me to say that which I ought not. If I had said so, surely Thou wouldst have known it; Thou knowest what is in Me, and I know what is in Thee; for thou art the knower of secrets. I have not said unto them any other than what Thou didst



command me ; namely : Worship God, my Lord and your, Lord."

The attributes of God as presented by Mohammed are numerous and complete ; the first lesson of the boy at school being the committal to memory of the adjectives used in the Koran to express his character ; of which they find nearly one hundred. Among these are his eternity, his omnipotence, his omniscience, and the intellectual and moral attributes usually ascribed to him by Jews and Christians. The most striking characteristic of Mohammed's view of God is the large place which he gives to his mercy ; while the Christian idea of the "righteousness of God" has no sort of acknowledgement from his lips or pen. The universal introduction of all the 114 chapters, one only excepted, is "In the name of the most merciful God." Yet, as will appear, God is supposed to have no mercy, except for those who yield to Mohammed's sway ; and the idea of God's *righteousness* in forgiving the penitent is nowhere recognized.

In his allusions to the *works* and *providence* of God, Mohammed shows a clear recognition of the idea that God is *immanent* in his works ; the divine interposition in miracles, in creation and in providence, being all parts of a consistent system of agency ; while at the same time, with the advantage of the Old and New Testaments to guard him on this point, he has committed himself to a cosmogony which the light of science declares absurd. Not only in the original creation, and in miracles as wrought by Moses and Jesus, but in the germinating of seeds, and especially in the origin of human souls in infants born into the world, Mohammed teaches that there is a direct act of the Divine creating energy. Thus, speaking of the proof of the resurrection, he says (ch. xxii.) : "O men, if ye be in doubt concerning the resurrection, consider that we first created you of the dust of the ground. Afterwards we created you of seed, then of a little coagulated blood, then of a piece of flesh perfectly formed in part and in part imperfectly formed ; that we might make our power manifest unto you : and we caused that which we pleased to rest in the womb until the time of

delivery. Then we bring you forth infants ; and afterwards we permit you to attain your age of full strength ; and one of you dieth in his youth, and another of you is postponed to a decrepid age, so that he forgetteth whatever he knew. Thou seest the earth dried up and barren ; but when we send down rain thereon, it is put in motion and swelleth, and produceth every kind of luxuriant vegetables. This sheweth that God is the truth, and that He raiseth the dead to life, and that He is almighty ; and that the hour of judgment will come (there is no doubt thereof), and that God will raise again those that are in the graves." "They will ask thee concerning the spirit. Answer, The spirit was created at the command of my Lord." (Ch. xvii.) That God's sovereign and immediate act determines the lot of mortals, the doctrine made so effectual by the followers of Mohammed in inspiring nerve in battle in their armies, is plainly taught in the Koran. Thus in ch. iii. the prophet says : "If a wound hath happened unto you in battle, a wound hath already happened unto the unbelieving people : and *we cause* those days of differing success interchangeably to succeed each other among men ; that God may prove those that believe, and may have martyrs from among them." "No soul can die unless by the permission of God, according to what is written in the book containing the determination of things." "The fate of every man have we bound about his neck ; and we will produce unto him, on the day of the resurrection, the open book." (Ch. xvii.) "Nothing happeneth in the earth, nor in your persons, but that the same was entered in our book of decrees, before we created it." (Ch. lvii.)

While the views of Mohammed on these points are to be commended, his claims to inspiration are of course set aside by his gross statements as to the *modus operandi* of the Creator in forming the universe ; an error from which a Divine mind preserved Moses and all the writers of the Old and New Testaments. Thus in Mohammed's plain statements the earth as the centre of the creation occupied four days in forming ; it was made before the heavens or heavenly bodies ; all these were made as lesser works, in two days ; the arch of heaven is built

up from the earth around, and the stars are lights hung therein, so small that they may be taken in the hand and hurled; and the earth, after the oriental idea, is flat, floating unsteadily upon water, and held down by the mountains, which act as make-weights, or pins, to fasten it. "Do ye indeed (ch. xli.) disbelieve in Him who created the earth in two days? He is the Lord of all creatures. And He placed in the earth mountains, firmly rooted, rising above the same. And He provided therein the food of the creatures thereof, in four days. Then He set his mind to the creation of the heavens, and it was smoke." "And He formed them into seven heavens in two days." In other places Mohammed speaks of the moon as a ball, which, at the day of judgment, will "split in sunder;" (ch. liv.) and of the stars as fiery meteors, which devils seek to steal, but which are hurled by angels at devils. He says: "We created man of dried clay, of black mud formed into shape, and before we had created the devil of subtle fire." "We have placed the twelve signs in the heaven, and have arranged them in various figures for beholders to admire, and we guard them from every devil, driving them away with stones, except him who listeneth by stealth; at whom they are hurled as a glowing flame." Of those that have accused him of forgery he says: "If we please, we will cause a piece of the heaven to fall on them." (Ch. xxxiv.) Again, "And He hath thrown upon the earth mountains firmly rooted, lest it should move with you." (Ch. xvi.) "He hath created the heavens without visible pillars to sustain them, and thrown on the earth mountains firmly rooted, lest it should move with you." (Ch. xxxi.) "Have we not made the earth for a bed, and the mountains for stakes to fix the same." These expressions, occurring constantly in the Koran, are so stated that they cannot be regarded as mere figures of speech, or use of popular language; and the contrast between them and the allusions of the Old and New Testaments to the structure of the universe forces itself on the notice and comparison of intelligent minds. This is distinctly understood by Mohammedan doctors; so much so that it gives cast to their course of education for youth. The fact that their sacred volume



cannot stand a moment before the light of modern science, excludes from the Mohammedan colleges every branch of science; making their instruction to consist entirely of language, rhetoric and the political and moral system of their religion.

The views of man's religious character, and of redemption, held by Mohammed, are rather negatively than positively taught in the Koran. The ingratitude and impiety of men who believe not in Mohammed as the prophet of God is constantly urged; but there is no idea of general depravity, as taught in the Old and New Testaments, presented. In fact the Mohammedan Doctors, in their teachings, deny the Christian doctrine of depravity; *first*, in order to get rid of the necessity for regeneration taught by Christ in the words, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God;" and, *second*, to disprove the demand for a propitiatory sacrifice taught in the declarations of Jesus and of his great apostle, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations;" "and without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins." Doubtless the distrust of death-bed repentances is legitimate under Christianity; but the denial of the possibility of repentance, or its acceptance after a certain crisis of life, must be founded upon a principle directly opposed to the Christian system. Mohammed says (ch. iv.): Verily repentance will be accepted of those who do evil ignorantly, and then speedily repent. But no repentance shall be accepted from those who do evil until death presenteth itself unto one of them, and he saith, Verily I repent now."

To do away with the sacrifice of Christ, and of course to oppose its design, Mohammed teaches that Christ did not die; that his image was stamped upon an infamous man who was made to supply his place; that Jesus was only a man like Adam, and his mission had no divine moral necessity like that presented in the Gospel connected with his death. All his statements as to Christ's life show how firmly the main facts of Christ's divine origin and supernatural character are

fixed in the historical traditions of Western Asia ; how much of fable human imagination has there added to the simple record of the inspired Gospels ; and how great ingenuity Mohammed employed to gain the advantage of an assent to the reality and greatness of Christ's mission, while he skilfully gave such a complexion to it as not to interfere with his own claims as a prophet coming after Christ. Thus in the sixth chapter, entitled " Mary," the object of which revelation is to confirm his connection with Jesus, as also with Abraham and Moses, as inspired teachers, he gives this narrative : " Remember in the book of the Koran the story of Mary ; when she retired from her family to a place towards the east ; and took a veil to conceal herself from them ; and we sent our spirit Gabriel unto her, and he appeared unto her in the shape of a perfect man. She said, I fly for refuge unto the merciful God, that he may defend me from thee : if thou fearest Him thou wilt not approach me. He answered, Verily I am the messenger of thy Lord, and am sent to give thee a holy son. She said, How shall I have a son, seeing a man hath not touched me, and I am no harlot ? Gabriel replied, So shall it be : thy Lord saith, This is easy with me ; and we will perform it, that we may ordain him for a sign unto men, and a mercy from us ; for it is decreed. Wherefore she conceived him ; and she retired aside, with him in her womb, to a distant place ; and the pains of childbirth came upon her near the trunk of a palm tree. She said, Would to God I had died before this, and had become a thing forgotten and lost in oblivion. And he who was beneath her called to her, saying, Be not grieved ; now hath God provided a rivulet unto thee ; and do thou shake the body of the palm tree, and it shall let fall ripe dates upon thee, ready gathered. And eat, and drink, and calm thy mind. Moreover, if thou see any man, and he question thee, say, Verily I have vowed a fast unto the Merciful : wherefore I will by no means speak to a man this day. So she brought the child to her people, carrying him in her arms. And they said unto her, O Mary, now hast thou done a strange thing : O sister of Aaron, thy father was not a bad man, neither was thy mother a harlot. But

she made signs unto the child to answer them ; and they said, How shall we speak to him, who is an infant in the cradle ? Whereupon the child said, Verily I am the servant of God ; He hath given me the book of the Gospel, and hath appointed me a prophet. And He hath made me blessed wherever I shall be ; and hath commanded me to observe prayer, and to give alms so long as I shall live : and He hath made me dutiful towards my mother, and hath not made me proud or unhappy. And peace be on me the day whereon I was born, and the day whereon I shall die, and the day whereon I shall be raised to life. This was Jesus, the son of Mary ; the Word of truth concerning whom they doubt. It is not meet that God should have any son ; God forbid !” This lengthy extract is at once a specimen of Mohammed’s style of address, and of his mode of employing the Gospel history.

A brief summary of Jesus’ life during his ministry is found in the following extract from chapter v. : “ When God shall say, O Jesus son of Mary, remember my favor towards thee, and towards thy mother ; when I strengthened thee with the Holy Spirit that thou shouldest speak unto men in the cradle, and when thou wast grown up ; and when I taught thee the Scripture and wisdom and the law and the Gospel ; and when thou didst create of clay as it were the figure of a bird, by my permission, and Thou didst heal one blind from his birth, and the leper, by my permission ; and when I withheld the children of Israel from killing thee, when thou hadst come to them with evident miracles, and such of them as believed not said, This is nothing but manifest sorcery.” This studious effort to imply that Jesus wrought miracles, not by his own power but by God’s “ *permission*,” is in keeping with all Mohammed’s crafty turn given to Christ’s life, to make them aid his own claim. The pretence that Christ was not put to death by the Jews, often alluded to, is more fully stated in the ivth chapter : “ They have said, Verily we have slain Christ Jesus, the son of Mary ; yet they slew him not, neither crucified him, but he was represented by one in his likeness ; and verily they who disagreed concerning him were in a doubt as to this matter, and had no sure knowledge there-



of, but followed only an uncertain opinion. They did not really kill him ; but God took him up unto Himself ; and God is mighty and wise. And there shall not be one of those that have received the Scriptures that shall not believe in him before his death." As to the disagreement mentioned above, the controversies of the early Church, as well as their corruptions, gave Mohammed a power which can hardly in modern times be appreciated. It is manifested strikingly in the ixth chapter, where we read : "The Jews say, Ezra is the Son of God ; and the Christians say Christ is the Son of God. May God resist them ! How are they infatuated ! They take their priests and their monks for their Lords, besides God, and Christ the son of Mary ; although they are commanded to worship one God only ; there is no God but He ; far be that from him which they associate with Him !"

Of course this teaching of Mohammed, while suggesting truths of great value, as for instance, that all who have the Scriptures, or the Jews, must yet believe in Christ—all this teaching is designed to strike at the foundation of the Christian doctrine of justification by faith in Christ, as a Divine sacrifice offered in propitiation for man's sins. The doctrine of Christ as to the associate part of Redemption, regeneration by the Divine Spirit, given to those who are justified by faith in Him, though not directly denied by Mohammed, has been opposed by philosophic teachers of the Koran. The force of such an incident as that reported some months since by Dr. Duff, of a Mohammedan inquirer, becomes apparent when seen in the light reflected upon it by these teachings of the Koran. After the inquirer alluded to had for many weeks been intelligently studying Christian truth until he embraced it, not simply from intellectual conviction, but from the experimental witness of the Divine Spirit, Dr. Duff asked him why he had not been satisfied with nor obtained peace of mind from the Koran, when it was so radiant with teachings as to the mercy of God, and so full of promises of forgiveness to the truly penitent. Said the convert, after a little reflection, "I wanted to see how God could be just and forgive ; I could not feel satisfied to be pardoned through the mercy of God."

In the department of *Eschatology*, the teachings of the Koran are important in their bearing on the questions of the Resurrection, Judgment, Heaven and Hell, as taught in the New Testament. The arguments for the resurrection are drawn from the original creating act of God, and his continued virtual creation of plants, of animals and of man, in the mysterious manner called by us "the *law of generation*;" though a *law* is not a *power*, but only a *mode* of action. Thus in ch. xvi. he says: "He hath created man of seed; and yet behold he is a professed disputer against the resurrection." Again, ch. xxxvi.; "One sign of the resurrection unto them is the dead earth; we quicken the same by the rain, and produce thereout various sorts of grain, of which they eat." "Ye know that we originally created you: Will ye not therefore believe that we can raise you from the dead?"

The *Judgment* is pictured in glowing colors by Mohammed. "On a certain day (ch. xvii.) we will call all men to judgment with their respective leaders: and whosoever shall have his book given him into his right hand shall read their book with joy and satisfaction; he shall not be wronged a hair. And whosoever hath been blind in this life shall be blind also in the next, and shall wander more widely from the path of salvation." "They reject (ch. xxv.) the belief of the hour of judgment as a falsehood; and we have prepared for him who shall reject the belief of that hour, burning fire; when it shall see them from a distant place, they shall hear it furiously raging and roaring. And when they shall be cast, bound together, into a straight place thereof, they shall there call for death; but it shall be answered, Call not for one death, but for many deaths. Say, Is this better, or a garden of eternal duration, which is promised unto the pious?" "The hour of judgment cometh (ch. liv.) and the moon hath been split in sunder." "On that day the heavens shall be shaken, and shall reel; and the mountains shall walk and pass away."

The pictures of Heaven and Hell are fearfully gross and sensual; and as we read of the latter, we are reminded of a forcible remark of the able French Protestant, the Count de Gasparin; that the idea of physical torment in the future

world, and penances in the flesh on earth, spring from the same corrupt priestcraft. Such grovelling lures to lust, and such sneering sarcasm, apparently gloating over the horrid fancies it has pictured for the future prison house of the lost, seem to partake of a spirit, itself most sensual, infected from the very pit it has dug for others. "They who believe not shall have garments of fire fitted unto them; boiling water shall be poured over their heads; their bowels shall be dissolved thereby, also their skins; and they shall be beaten with maces of iron. So often as they shall endeavor to get out of hell, because of the anguish of their torments, they shall be dragged back into the same; and their tormentors shall say unto them, Take ye the pain of burning." "On that day (ch. lii.) woe be unto those who accused God's prophet of imposture, who amused themselves with wading in foul waters of dispute! On that day shall they be driven and thrust into the fires of hell: and it shall be said unto them, This is the fire which ye denied as a fiction. Is this a magic *delusion*? Or do ye not see it? Enter the same, and be scorched." "The transgressors shall remain therein for ages: they shall not taste any refreshment therein or any drink, except boiling water and filthy ordure." (Chap. lxxviii.)

On the other hand the pictures of Heaven are images of the grossest sensualism. "The righteous (ch. xxii.) God shall introduce into gardens through which rivers flow: they shall be adorned with bracelets of gold and pearls, and their vestures therein shall be silk." "The pious shall dwell amidst gardens and pleasures; leaning on couches disposed in order, and we will espouse them unto virgins having large black eyes." "The pious (ch. lxxvii.) shall dwell amidst shades and fountains and fruits of the kinds which they shall desire; and it shall be said unto them, Eat and drink with easy digestion." "For the pious (ch. lxxviii.) is prepared a place of bliss; gardens planted with trees, and vineyards, and damsels with swelling breasts, of equal age with their partners, and a full wine-cup."

As Mohammed's character as a warrior-prophet became more positive, the conflict hotter, and animosities more bitter, his revelations are fuller of these pictures; and a rhetorical



round of exclamations and apostrophe, always recognized as belonging to fanaticism, is the style assumed for effect. The following extracts from chapters lv. and lvi. are specimens of this style; and they strike the Christian reader from their contrast with the New Testament pictures, all of which are declared to be but imagery; the "bread of heaven" being the "word of God," the "water of life" the gift of "the Spirit," the "white linen" the "righteousness of the saints," and the attachments that unite souls there, the pure love of a world where "they neither marry nor are given in marriage."

"We will surely attend to judge you, O men and genii, at the last day. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? O ye collective body of genii and men, if ye be able to pass out of the confines of heaven and earth, pass forth: ye shall not pass forth but by absolute power. Which, therefore of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? A flame of fire without smoke, and a smoke without flame, shall be sent down upon you; and ye shall not be able to defend yourselves therefrom. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? And when the heaven shall be rent in sunder, and shall become red as a rose, and shall melt like ointment: (Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny?) On that day neither man nor genius shall be asked concerning his sin. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? The wicked shall be known by their marks; and they shall be taken by the forelocks, and by the feet, and shall be cast into hell. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? This is hell, which the wicked deny as a falsehood: they shall pass to and fro between the same and hot boiling water. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? But for him who dreadeth the tribunal of his Lord are prepared two gardens (Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny?), planted with shady trees. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? In each of them shall be two fountains flowing. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? In each of them shall there be of every fruit two kinds. Which, therefore, of your Lord's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? They shall repose on couches, the linings whereof shall be of thick silk, interwoven with gold: and the fruit of the two

gardens shall be near at hand to gather. Which, therefore, of you LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Therein shall receive them beauteous damsels, refraining their eyes from beholding any besides their spouses: whom no man shall have deflowered before them, neither any genius; (Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny?) having complexions like rubies and pearls. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Shall the reward of good works be any other good? Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? And besides these there shall be two other gardens (Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny?) of a dark green. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? In each of them shall be two fountains pouring forth plenty of water. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? In each of them shall be fruits, and palm trees, and pomegranates. Which, therefore of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Therein shall be agreeable and beauteous damsels, (which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny?) having fine black eyes, and kept in pavilions from public view. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Whom no man shall have deflowered before their destined spouses, nor any genius. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Therein shall they delight themselves, lying on green cushions and beautiful carpets. Which, therefore, of your LORD's benefits will ye ungratefully deny? Blessed be the name of thy LORD, possessed of glory and honor!" (Ch. liii.)

"When the earth shall be shaken with a violent shock; and the mountains shall be dashed in pieces, and shall become as dust scattered abroad; and ye shall be separated into three distinct classes: the companions of the right hand; (how happy shall the companions of the right hand be!) and the companions of the left hand; (how miserable shall the companions of the left hand be!) and those who have preceded others in the faith shall precede them to Paradise. These are they who shall approach near unto God, they shall dwell in gardens of delight (there shall be many of the former religious, and few of the last.), reposing on couches adorned with gold and precious stones; sitting opposite to one another thereon. Youths which shall continue in their bloom for ever, shall go round about to attend them, with goblets, and beakers, and a cup of flowing wine: their heads shall not ache by drinking the same, neither shall their reason be dis-

turbed: and with fruits of the sorts which they shall choose, and the flesh of birds of the kind which they shall desire. And there shall accompany them fair damsels having large black eyes; resembling pearls hidden in their shells; as a reward for that which they shall have wrought. They shall not hear therein any vain discourse, or any charge of sin; but only the salutation, Peace! Peace! And the companions of the right hand (how happy shall the companions of the right hand be!) shall have their abode among lote trees free from thorns, and trees of maruz loaded regularly with their produce from top to bottom; under an extended shade, near a flowing water, and amidst fruits in abundance, which shall not fail, nor shall be forbidden to be gathered: and they shall repose themselves on lofty beds. Verily we have created the damsels of Paradise by a peculiar creation: and we have made them virgins beloved by their husbands of equal age with them; for the delight of the companions of the right hand. There shall be many of the former religious, and many of the latter. And the companions of the left hand (how miserable shall the companions of the left hand be!) shall dwell amidst burning winds and scalding water, under the shade of a black smoke, neither cool nor agreeable. For they enjoyed the pleasures of life before this while on earth; and obstinately persisted in a heinous wickedness; and they said, After we shall have died, and become dust and bones, shall we surely be raised to life? Shall our forefathers also be raised with us? Say, Verily, both the first and the last shall surely be gathered together to judgment, at the prefixed time of a known day. Then ye, O men, who have erred, and denied the resurrection as a falsehood, shall surely eat of the fruit of the tree of al Zakkum, and shall fill your bellies therewith: and ye shall drink thereon boiling water; and ye shall drink as a thirsty camel drinketh. This shall be their entertainment on the day of Judgment." (Ch. lvi.)

The *moral code*, based upon the religious principles thus developed into a theological system, shows the human imperfection belonging to an uninspired mind. In regard to *duties to ourself*, which the Gospel teaches by general principles, so as to secure the end of self-control over all our appetites and passions, Mohammed attempted arbitrary restraint upon, instead of self government of man's natural impulses. Thus, though wine in overflowing cups is to be furnished to the



pious in Paradise. Mohammed, seeing its effect, on soldiers especially, at first indirectly, then directly forbid it; as also "lot," corresponding to modern *cards*. Thus (ch. ii.) he says: "They will ask thee concerning wine and lots. Answer, In both there is great sin; and also some things of use to men; but their sinfulness is greater than their use." Again (ch. v.) he takes stronger ground: "O true believers, surely wine, and lots, and images and divining arrows,\* are an abomination of the work of Satan; therefore avoid them, that ye may prosper. Satan seeketh to sow dissension and hatred among you by means of wine and lots, and to divert you from remembering God, and from prayer: Will ye not then abstain from them. Obey God; and obey the apostle; and take heed to yourselves." The *philosophic* among Mohammed's followers, who have from early days made the philosophy, as well as the *logic*, called Aristotelian, their chosen study,—though that philosophy had its germ in India, whose collections of science, literature and general learning Alexander the Conqueror used to send back to his revered teacher as materials for his great study,—the philosophic Mohammedan teachers have found in the first admission of Mohammed here made, a confirmation of their own and of Aristotle's theory, that man's nature is *not depraved totally*; that the indulgence of every natural impulse is a *virtue*; that every virtue, however, has two opposite vices, excessive and deficient indulgence; abstemiousness and excess being vices, and temperance the mediate virtue; rashness and cowardice being vices, and the mediate courage the virtue. The *dogmatic* Mohammedan teacher, however, insists that Mohammed forbade altogether the use of wine; and yet he cannot call to account "the faithful" if they use *brandy* instead of wine. There seems to have been reference to the spirit of the Gospel teaching in Mohammed's direction about food that may be eaten. Thus in his vi. th chapter, he severely condemns those who, after the manner of the Jews, forbid certain meats and fruits; saying, "They are utterly lost . . . who have forbidden that which

---

\* Different games of chance.

God hath given them for food, devising a lie against God ;" seeming to have in his mind here Paul's statement in I. Tim. iv: 3. Frequently he groups in the same connection four forbidden articles, all but one of which are those suggested by the Christian Council met at Jerusalem, as recorded Acts xv: 29 ; adding even to this prohibition a qualification like to that alluded to by Christ in David's case. (Matt. xii: 3, 4.) Thus in chapter xvi., Mohammed says : " Eat of that which God hath given you for food ; which is lawful and good ; and be thankful for the favors of God, if ye serve Him. He hath only forbidden to you that which dieth of itself, and blood, and swine's flesh, and that which hath been slain in the name of any beside God. But unto him who shall be compelled to eat of these things by necessity, not lusting nor wilfully transgressing, God will surely be gracious and merciful."

The statutes of Mohammed as to *domestic society*, though comparatively excellent as to the relation of master and servant, and of parent and child, are comparatively ignoble as to the relation of husband and wife. The laws of consanguinity, and of intermarriage with other nations, are much the same in the Koran as in the Old Testament. As to the number of wives allowed, Mohammed teaches the unsatisfied of the faithful, " Take in marriage of such other women as please you, two, or three, or four, not more. But if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably towards so many, marry one only, or take of the slaves which ye shall have acquired." (ch. xl:) As to conjugal *discipline*, the prophet says : " Those of whose perverseness ye shall be apprehensive, rebuke; and remove them into separate apartments and chastise them." The safeguard against the natural strife seen in Jacob's household is provided for in the Koran, as in Moses' law, thus : " Ye are forbidden to take to wife two sisters." The most objectionable features of Mohammed's pretended revelations on this subject, is the exemption which he obtained for himself, in violation of his own laws, written in the ivth chapter. The requirement that no man shall have more than four wives is so strict that the Sultans of Turkey are to this day limited to that number ; while they are also bound by

law to have that number as the necessary accompaniment of their rank; the late Sultan Abdul Medjid, for instance, coming to the throne at twenty years of age, being obliged to divorce a young wife to whom he was attached, and to take four Georgian women as his wives. Again, the prohibition of the ivth chapter,—“Ye are forbidden to marry the wives of your sons, who are the fruit of your loins,”—had been understood by Mohammed’s followers to apply to adopted, as well as to natural sons. Yet again, the prohibition as to the laws of consanguinity was supposed to cover the children of aunts as well as the aunts themselves. Still again, the husband of two or more wives was bound by the law of custom, which had passed into a sacred moral obligation, to make each in turn the partner of his bed at night. Yet when Mohammed chanced to see in her undress, one day, Zeinab, the wife of Zeid, an adopted son of his, and had conceived a passion which he could not control, and had consequently influenced Zeid to divorce her, that his benefactor might marry her, much to the scandal of his nobler followers, Mohammed got an appendix to a former revelation (ch. xxxiii.), in which, besides immortalizing Zeid, the only one of his companions anywhere mentioned in the Koran, he receives these exemptions for himself from the Giver of his revelation: “It is not fit for a true believer of either sex, when God and his prophet have decreed a thing, that they should have the liberty of choosing a way of their own; and whosoever is disobedient unto God and his apostle surely erreth with a manifest error.” “When Zeid had determined the matter concerning her, and had resolved to divorce her, we joined her in marriage unto thee; lest a crime should be charged on the true believers in marrying the wives of their adopted sons, when they have determined the matter concerning them; and the command of God is to be performed. No crime is to be charged on the prophet as to what God hath allowed him, conformable to the ordinance of God with regard to those that preceded him (for the command of God is a determinate decree) who brought the messages of God.” “Mohammed is not the father of any man among you,



but the apostle of God and the seal of the prophets ; and God knoweth all things. O true believers, remember God with a frequent remembrance, and celebrate his praise morning and evening." "O prophet, we have allowed thee thy wives, unto whom thou hast given their dowers, and also the slaves which thy right hand possesseth of the booty which God hath granted thee ; and the daughters of thy uncle, and the daughters of thy aunts, both on thy father's side, and on thy mother's side, who have fled with thee from Mecca, and any other believing woman, if she give herself unto the prophet. This is a peculiar privilege granted unto thee above the rest of the true believers. We know what we have ordained them concerning their wives, and the slaves which their right hands possess : it should not be deemed a crime in thee to make use of the privilege granted thee ; for God is merciful and gracious. Thou mayest postpone the turn of such of thy wives as thou shalt please, in being called to thy bed ; and thou mayest take unto thee her whom thou shalt please, and her whom thou shalt desire, of those whom thou shalt have before rejected ; and it shall be no crime in thee." It is hard to repress the risings of indignation at the lustful lechery, the unmitigated selfishness, reeking in these so called *privileges* of the prophet ; much less to read without abhorrence the hypocrisy and the blasphemy which mingles pious ejaculations and pretences of Divine revelation with such vile suggestions as make up a large portion of this chapter.

The duty of children to parents, as it relates to their religious teaching, as well as to the return of their care in childhood, is strongly stated. "The Lord hath commanded that ye worship none but Him ; and that ye show kindness unto your parents, whether the one or both of them attain unto old age with thee. Wherefore say not unto them, Fie on you ! neither reproach them, but speak respectfully unto them ; and submit to behave humbly unto them, out of tender affection, and say, O Lord, have mercy on them both, who nursed me when I was little." (Ch. xvii.) "We have commanded man to show kindness unto his parents ; his mother beareth him in her womb with pain, and bringeth him forth with pain ; and the

space of his being carried in her womb and of his weaning is thirty months ; until, when he attaineth his age of strength and reacheth the age of forty years, he saith, O Lord excite me by thy inspiration, that I may be grateful for the favors wherewith thou hast favored me and my parents ; and that I may work righteousness which may please thee ; and be gracious unto me in my descendants ; for I am turned unto thee and am a Moslem." "He who saith unto his parents, Fie on you! Do ye promise me that I shall be taken forth from the grave and restored to life ; when many generations have passed away before me, and none of them have returned back ? And his parents implore God's assistance, and say to their son, Alas for thee ! Believe ; for the promise of God is true. But he answereth : This is none other than silly fables of the ancients. These are they whom the sentence passed on the nations which have been before them, of genii and of men, justly fitteth : they shall surely perish." (Ch. xlvi.) Here is hinted the principle on which the Mohammedan teachers have founded their laws of moral duty in the family ; the mother being the minister to the *physical appetites* of the child ; the fathers being bound to teach him to utter as the first word the name "*Allah !*" or God, to frame as his first repeated sentence, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet," and in general being the tutor of the passions and impulses of the child ; and finally the teacher training him first to repeat the entire Koran, while the public treasury not only supports the teacher, but furnishes books, clothing, and in part food to the pupil ; on account of which every man is bound, as an infant once nursed, and a child once trained, to aid his father and mother in time of old age, and in his maturity, as a true Moslem, to draw the sword for his country and his religion.

The provisions for *slaves* are comparatively humane ; and at the present day the condition of the slave is preferable to that of the native Arab of Egypt, or of Syria, under Turkish domination. "Marry such of your man-servants and maid-servants as are honest : if they be poor, God will enrich them with his abundance." "Unto such of your slaves as desire a

written instrument, allowing them to redeem themselves on paying a certain sum, write one, if ye know good in them ; and give them of the riches of good which he hath given you." And compel not your maid-servants to prostitute themselves, if they be willing to live chastely ; that ye may seek the casual advantage of this present life ; but whosoever shall compel thereto, verily God will be gracious and merciful unto such women after their compulsion." (Ch. xxiv.)

The duties of man in his social and civil relations are incidentally taught in the Koran. The general obligation of obedience to the civil head is found in the constantly repeated command, "Obey God and his prophet ;" the ruler being regarded as God's vicegerent, and the executor of his will as revealed in the Koran. Hence the civil government of all Mohammedan countries is strictly Patriarchal or Theocratical. No legislative branch has any place in such a government, for none is needed. The Law once given in the Koran, like that to Moses for the Jews, needs no additions ; the commentaries and expositions of learned men being all that is required. The entire class of the educated is resolved into the "Men of the Pen," who are the judges of the Law, and the "Men of the Sword," who are the executors of the Law. Among the Arabian tribes of the Desert the chief Patriarch, or "*Sheikh*," like the father of a family, judges every case according to its merits, taking but a few minutes for consideration after examination ; and the penalty is prescribed and inflicted at once. In the more artificial society of Turkish and Arabian city life, the *Cadi*, or town magistrate, judges minor offences, the *Mollah*, or District Judge, considers more complicated cases, and the Sheikh ul-Islam, a member of the Cabinet of State, is the Sultan's judicial adviser, and the Head of appeal from all the subordinate judges. In all judicial decisions the principles of the Koran, as ascertained by Commentators, by precedents and by their apparent bearing on the case in hand, are the rule of decision.

As the highest of social duties towards neighbors and friends "alms" is required ; but towards enemies, the spirit of revenge is not condemned as in the Gospel. Thus in the



second or leading chapter, we read: "They will ask thee concerning alms, what they shall give. Answer: What ye have to spare." By Mohammedan teachers of the superstitious order the merit of alms-giving has been so extended that it not only leads to provisions for men, but animals. The common bequest of a fund to dig a well by the roadside in a country destitute of water, to erect over it a covered colonnade, and to pension an old man or woman to have charge of it, is an interesting outgrowth of charity; but it is certainly a radical error when the *end* of charity as a means for *moral* good is lost sight of, so that birds which God himself provides for, and decrepid animals whose owners, for justice sake should be compelled to provide for, are fed by a fund left as a charity. Revenge is sanctioned, in the words (ch. xxii.): "Whosoever shall take a vengeance equal to the injury that has been done him, and shall afterwards be unjustly treated; verily God will assist him; for God is merciful and gracious." While, however, there is not a ray of love to enemies seen to beam in the Koran, the strictest regard to private property among their fellow-countrymen is enjoined; a principle of obligation so deeply rooted, that out of Mohammed's precept has grown a conventional morality so strict that a mantle dropped by the roadside will there remain for weeks till its owner returns to take it up, and that the public granary stands with its door unlocked without the least idea that any passer-by will enter to supply himself. The precept of the *Koran* presenting this principle is as follows: "O true believers, kill no game when ye are on a pilgrimage; whosoever among you shall kill any designedly shall restore the like of what he has killed, in domestic animals, according to the determination of two just persons among you, to be brought as an offering to the Caaba; or in atonement thereof shall feed the poor; or instead thereof shall fast that he may taste the heinousness of his deed."

The duties of *religion*, or service to God, are *four*, as taught by Mohammed; almsgiving, fasting, prayer, and pilgrimage, all of which, except the latter, are dwelt upon by Christ in connection in the Sermon on the Mount. While the former is

ranked among social duties, it is regarded also as a service done directly to God, when the gift is for a *religious* purpose; according to the statement (ch. xxii.): "Whoso maketh valuable offerings unto God, verily they proceed from the piety of men's hearts." The fast of the month Ramadan, during which, for thirty days, no food was to be taken from morning till night, is strictly enjoined (ch. ii.), while its provisions are of such a character that the nights are the seasons of most besotted sensual indulgence. "It is lawful for you on the nights of the fast to go in unto your wives; therefore go in unto them, and earnestly desire that which God ordaineth you; and eat and drink until ye can plainly distinguish a white thread from a black thread by the day-break; then keep the fast until night, and go not in unto them, but be constantly present in the places of worship." The very prohibition as to the day's indulgence here is an out-showing of the excessive and unresting sensuality to which, at this day, high Turkish officers, even the Sultan himself, are often given up.

The duty of *prayer* has a large place in the Koran, and the formality with which, under all circumstances, the traveller sees it observed, is specially impressive. In his ivth chapter, Mohammed teaches that the outward forms of prayer may in part be laid aside, when in war men must stand to their arms; and the prophet enjoins under such circumstances: "Remember God, standing and sitting and lying on your sides." In the vth chapter he states the formula of preparation, now observed: "O true believers, when ye prepare yourselves to pray, wash your faces and your hands unto the elbows; and rub your heads and your feet unto the ankles; and if ye be polluted . . . wash yourselves all over. But if ye be sick, or on a journey, . . . and ye find no water, take fine clean sand, and rub your faces and your hands therewith." The times of prayer are thus set forth (ch. xvii.): "Regularly perform thy prayer at the declension of the sun, at the first darkness of the night, and the prayer of the daybreak; for the prayer of daybreak is borne witness unto by the angels. And watch some part of the night in the same exercise, as a work of supererogation for thee; peradventure thy Lord will

raise thee to an honorable station." Of the value of night prayer he says in another place : " Verily the rising by night is more efficacious for steadfast continuance in devotion ; . . for in the daytime thou hast long employment." (Ch. lxxiii.)

The annual *pilgrimage* to Mecca is directly as well as indirectly enjoined: " God hath appointed the Caaba, the holy house, a place of pilgrimage for mankind; and hath ordained the sacred month, and the offering, and the ornaments hung in the holy house." (Ch. v.) " The holy temple of Mecca we have appointed for a place of worship unto all men. Call to mind when we gave the site of the house of the Caaba to Abraham; saying : Proclaim unto the people a solemn pilgrimage; let them come unto thee on foot and on every lean camel, coming from every different road, and prove the blessing of visiting this holy place." (Ch. xxii.) In connection with this sacred centre, the one hallowed among Jews and Christians was also exalted by Mohammed; so that now to the Mohammedan it is, as the name he gave, implies,—"*El Kûds esh-Shereef*"—*The Holy, The Chief Holy*. Thus (chap. xvii.) the " Night Journey," opens: " Praise be unto him who transported his servant by night, from the sacred temple of Mecca to the farther temple of Jerusalem, the circuit of which we have blessed, that we might show some of our signs; for God is He who heareth and seeth."

The forms of Mohammedan worship hang like a loose cloak on the Turk, who received the religion of the prophet only from policy; that, as conqueror of the cultured Arab race, for four centuries established in his belief, he might hold an easier sway; and the power that reigns at Constantinople is now just as ready to receive the Frank religion as it was thirty years ago to adopt the Frank trousers and frock coat, provided policy recommends it. The Arab is a practical, quick-minded race; once, in the days of Haroun el Raschid, the most able and curious in science, as the very names, Algebra, Alchymy, indicating the origin of our own higher Mathematics and Chemistry, bear witness; and the Arab, now eager for investigation, must soon grasp the truths in physical science and in spiritual revelation which will show the Koran to be



the work of a designing man, exposed to the errors of the day and people among whom he lived. The Persian is a highly reflective race; deeply thoughtful in the principles of mental and moral science, and in speculative religious questions; the people among whom Zoroaster arose, by whom Aristotelian philosophy is still studied, and to whom Gospel truth is full of strange interest when it breaks upon them. No one can ponder the inherent weakness of Mohammed's claim to inspiration, and his own attestation to the miraculous testimonials of Jesus, without seeing how the Koran must, like the Old Testament, prove a "primary school teacher to lead inquiring minds to Christ." No one can observe the weakness and dependence on Christian nations of the civil head of the Mohammedan world, without being struck with the Turk's own conviction, that the crescent is indeed waning, that it has never given forth but a reflected light, and that a sun of righteousness with healing in his beams is needed for man corrupted and degenerate as the once energetic Turk now is.

The gatherer of these gleanings from Mohammed's own statements as to his religious system, was fourteen years ago riding from Gaza to Jerusalem, surrounded by a strangely differing retinue of Christians from Egypt, Syria, and Armenia; of Jews from the neighboring towns of old Judea, and of Mohammedans from different regions; all going to the Holy City to spend the week sacred to the Jews as that of their Passover, to the Christians as their festival of Easter, and to the Mohammedan as the place of Mohammed's "Night Journey." The muleteer was a Turk, and cared not a straw for prayers towards Mecca, or any rite of his religion. The faithful body-servant was an intelligent Arab, who seemed half ashamed of the forms of his worship, often neglecting them, and was curious in his inquiries as to the difference between Western and Eastern Christians. In the crowd there walked a man of noble form and intellectual brow; a Mohammedan dervish from Boghary on the east of Persia, who had gone on foot on a pilgrimage of months from Persia to Mecca, and finding no satisfaction of soul, was now on his way to "El Kûds esh Shereef" to seek relief there. His forlorn and sad aspect,

scorned by the nominal Christians around him, and little noticed even by his co-religionist, the Turk, drew the traveller's sympathy towards him; his satchel was tied to the load of a mule; bread and dates were distributed to him, as to the poor Coptic Christians from Egypt; and, at his asking, water for his ablutions at the hours of prayer was furnished from the skin water bottle. Not only at the appointed hour, but often in the night time his broken cries in prayer were heard, as in touching accents he prayed to "Allah" for pardon and peace of soul. On the last day's journey a donkey was specially hired for him when, foot sore, he had fallen, and was bruised on the rocks. As the hotel door in the Sacred City was reached, he pressed his benefactor's hand, pouring forth thanks with streaming eyes. He was lost in a few moments in the thronging crowd that pressed past; and his face was seen no more. All that acts could do to commend the pure religion of Jesus had been done; and the conviction was strong and comforting that such men of God as Gobat at Jerusalem, with Christ's Gospel in their hands, must reach and win such minds as these.

---

#### ARTICLE III.—THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

---

[BY PROF. OSCAR HOWES, OF SHURTLEFF COLLEGE, ILL.]

---

It is natural that the rise and rapid growth of the Science of Language should invest with new interest a question which scarcely needed, however, to be rendered more attractive—the old and still new question as to the origin of language. Though, from a want of facts, no theory on this subject can claim for itself a strictly scientific basis, yet the pursuits and investigations of the student of language naturally and almost inevitably bring him face to face with this problem; and if he

allows his eye once to meet its sphynx-like gaze, it will be a vain task to try to escape its fascination. He must make his attempt at least at a solution.

When the facts in reference to any given subject are sufficiently numerous, thinking minds generally coincide as to the true theory. But when facts are scanty, the induction must necessarily be partial and imperfect. In the absence of facts, the deficiency must be supplied by speculation, and as speculation has no objective basis, theories must vary much as the minds of the individuals who form them. Hence the general rule, that the fewer the facts, the more numerous the theories. It is no matter of surprise, therefore, that men do not agree in their theories of the origin of language. We have, of course, no record which dates back to the commencement of human speech; nor has any nation or tribe of men been discovered not already possessing a fully developed language. Our knowledge, therefore, must, from the nature of the case, be prevented from ever reaching the highest degree of certainty. The fact that this subject has been specially prolific in apparently fruitless speculations, may not unnaturally raise a question in the minds of some as to the utility of consuming time in inquiries where induction must necessarily rest on so slender a basis of fact, and where, consequently, theory is so likely to run wild. But the human mind is so constituted as imperatively to demand a cause for every effect which comes under its observation. Though this craving is so strong as frequently to lead the mind in its eagerness to satisfy it to accept of inadequate and absurd theories, any injury which may have thus resulted is far more than compensated by the stimulus which this desire has lent to the investigation of truth. If, too, an inquiry derives dignity and importance from the magnitude of the effect which it seeks to explain, the inquiry into the origin of language necessarily takes its place by the side of the most interesting questions which can be presented to the human mind for solution. For certainly there is no more marvellous creation in this world of marvels than human speech. The only reason it has ceased to excite our wonder is because it has become so familiar.



But to him who rightly considers it, the power which we possess to convey accurately to each other all thought and emotion is second only in mysteriousness to the power of thought itself. What can be more truly wonderful than this fact of daily occurrence, that by a mere effort of the vocal organs — an effort which it is in the power of a child to put forth, precisely the same thought, at the same moment of time, takes possession of hundreds of minds; that the thin and unsubstantial air—the idle wind which passes by, and we regard it not, as it rushes swiftly through its narrow passage — takes on the exact form and impress of the still more impalpable thought, and, by the invisible aid of innumerable kindred airy messengers, transfers the impress, indefinitely multiplied but still unchanged, to all the minds in the many headed throng. It is not the mere mystery of the transmission of sound, though even this is beyond our comprehension, but that sound becomes freighted with intelligence, — moulded to the expression of all the varied and complicated workings of the human mind, even to the subtlest fancies and the most delicate shades of emotion, and instead of the mere vague impressions that belong to all sound, conveying “thoughts that breathe” in “words that burn,” and chaining and unchaining the passions of the human heart at will. It becomes the plastic medium of that infinitely varied interchange of thought and feeling which binds men together in social compact, and renders possible that unity of action and effort which has resulted in the splendid achievements of science and art.

It was not without a deep meaning, therefore, that Homer applied to man the epithet *μέροψ*, voice-dividing or articulating, as the characteristic which, above every thing else, distinguishes him from all the other inhabitants of the earth; since, without this crowning endowment, reason itself would be almost useless, and all the higher faculties of the mind would lack the exercise indispensable to their suitable development. In fact, man would no longer be man in the fullest and highest sense of the word. Language is thus seen to be not simply the medium for the expression of thought, but also the means and stimulus of thought; that without which thought would

exist only in its lowest and least valuable forms. Viewed in this light, human speech cannot fail to be an object of the highest interest; and no effort can properly be considered as misapplied which shall tend to shed light on the true origin of that which is so intimately connected with the highest development and the highest happiness of man. We have some hope that by the aid of a few facts so arranged as to serve as finger-posts, we may be able to find our way even over a dark road, and arrive, in the end, at a conclusion which shall at least approximate to the truth.

It will not be necessary here to notice all the theories that have been propounded on this subject. The theory which maintains that language sprung from the imitation of natural sounds, — though Herder's essay in support of it secured the prize of the Berlin Academy, — as well as that which derives it from interjections and involuntary exclamations, can scarcely claim a serious attempt at refutation. They fail utterly to meet the exigencies of the case. Such theoretical freaks are valuable only as curiosities, or as indications of the almost irresistible tendency of the human mind, already mentioned, to adopt some mode of explaining every effect which strongly impresses it.

There are, however, three theories which, with but slight modifications, have hitherto divided and will probably continue to divide the support of those who have given their thoughts to this subject. The first of these we shall call the *development theory*.

Though this theory appears under a variety of forms, they are all but modifications of the same ground-idea, that man slowly and gradually emerged from a natural state of mutism, and through many intervening steps and a long and toilsome progress, finally arrived at the ability to use articulate speech as a means of communication. It matters little whether it is supposed that the result is due solely to the slow action of some natural law, or that this agency was assisted, and its operation accelerated by the voluntary and concerted action of men; it is still the development theory. For all such concerted action presupposes that man has passed through antecedent stages of progress, and has thus acquired that proficiency

in the means of communication which could alone render possible united consultation for such an object. The theory is presented somewhat more fully in the following statement quoted from one of its advocates. After assuming that signs would be the first means of communication, he says: "A people raised but a single step above the crudeness of savage life would need some means of communicating their thoughts, their desires, their projects, their emotions, — and finding by experience that they were endowed with the power of articulating distinct sounds, they would probably soon combine a few of those sounds with signs. In proportion to their advancement in the cultivation of their powers, they would gradually increase the number of articulate sounds, definitely fixing the sense of each, and at the same time diminish the number of signs, laying aside the more slow and laborious method of communication, and substituting the more convenient."

One would suppose that such writers had never read the first chapter of Genesis, and that, in their view, God had created a nation of savages as the progenitors of the human race; or, perhaps, in order to be consistent, they would even go so far as to adopt the development theory also as to the origin of the human race, and find our ancestors in the unsightly submarine monsters that, in the remoteness of time, swarmed in the waters which then covered the face of the earth; and, tracing further our descent, would find our ancestral line graced by the noble reptile with his plated mail and his magnificent jaws bristling with glittering ivory; or, ascending still higher in the scale, would discover man's more immediate progenitor in the shaggy gorilla with brawn and muscle that none of his degenerate descendants would even dream of rivalling. Nay, could not these profound investigators into the origin of things detect the first faint dawnings of human speech in the delicate whisperings of the serpent, and a more advanced stage of it in the fantastic squeaking and gibbering of the ape and the baboon!

But some, at least, of the defenders of this theory would no doubt be shocked at the idea that in advocating their posi-



tion they were in any sense taking up arms against the Bible. Let us, therefore, with something of a stretch of generosity, give them credit for receiving the Scripture account of the creation of man. But, in that case, what a grovelling conception must such theorists have of the dignity and excellence of man as he came from the hand of his Maker; and of the social condition of our first parents in that brief home in Paradise to which we are accustomed to point as the purest and highest ideal of earthly happiness and of human perfection. It would seem as if none but those who could reconcile themselves to the idea that man, with his noble powers, has grovelled in the form of the lowest representatives of the animal creation, occupying successively the position of the oyster, the fish, the reptile, the baboon, the man, would be willing to suppose that in his first and best estate, he was scarcely above the brute in his ability to express himself, conveying imperfectly his crude ideas by gesticulation and uncouth sounds ejaculated without articulation. In that case, we should be rudely brought down from the lofty conception so accordant with the account of Holy Writ, presented to us by Milton in his description of our first parents, with their mutual greetings when first they saw each other, and their loving and delightful converse. Disenchanted of this pleasant hallucination, we should be obliged to accommodate ourselves, as best we could, to the homely fact that when Adam, in speechless delight, beheld his fair spouse before him, he at most indulged in a huge grunt of satisfaction, and that Eve answered his sonorous bass with fitting treble; and that if ever under such circumstances they arrived at the ability to hold respectable intercourse with each other — which is extremely improbable — it could have been only after a long and tedious period of tutelage under that hardest of schoolmasters, experience; a fact which would have postponed their highest enjoyment of each other's society to their old age, and probably until after their great enemy had succeeded in poisoning all their sources of enjoyment.

Now no theory can be tolerated which denies or ignores the fact taught in the Scriptures, that man was created in the high-

est perfection, — with that complete harmony of action among all his powers, physical, intellectual, and moral, which is calculated to secure not only the highest excellence of character, but also the utmost degree of vigor and efficiency of the intellect. From this fact alone, independently of the express declaration of Scripture, we should necessarily infer the existence of language in Eden. For if the constitution of the human mind was the same then as we now find it — and no reason can be assigned for any change — it could have existed in its highest perfection only in connection with articulate language. For such is the relation established between thought and language, that thought never reaches its highest maturity and excellence, except through the medium of this highest form of expression. Any adequate conception of the perfection of man, when first created, compels us to the belief that his means of giving utterance to his thoughts were as perfect as his thoughts were elevated; that the intercourse between beings the vigor and delicacy of whose minds, as well as bodies, were unimpaired by that insidious poison which has since tainted and sapped all his faculties, must have required a language capable of expressing the most varied thoughts and emotions, and the most ethereal conceptions. Indeed, Paradise could not have been Paradise, if the mind had been deprived of its highest and most characteristic manifestation in language fitted to its profoundest thoughts and loftiest aspirations. We must, therefore, conclude that man commenced his career in possession of that which is at once the highest expression and the invaluable instrument of thought — articulate speech. The development theory, however, in all its forms, is based on precisely the opposite assumption. It denies man's early possession of language, and by consequence denies man's original perfection; and in this double denial detaches itself from the sympathies and respect of all men, and thus deservedly falls to the ground.

The second theory which claims our notice, we shall designate as the *instinctive theory*. This theory maintains that man talks as the bird sings, because it is his nature. Language is the natural and necessary result of his mental con-

stitution. It is the spontaneous outburst into outward expression of that peculiar and higher nature which has been conferred upon man, and denied to all other inhabitants of the earth.

The very sound of this theory has a charm. The objections to it, if any there be, must be of a very different character from those urged against the development theory. It can be no matter of surprise that it meets with a ready welcome, and has become the favorite theory of modern science. It speaks to man, the lord of creation, with a syren's voice. It remains to be seen whether it does not also possess some other quality of the syren.

The mildest form of this theory is propounded by Mr. Geo. P. Marsh,\* in his "*Lectures on the English Language*." He in some sense adopts the theory, but with such modifications as almost to set it aside. In his hesitation to embrace it in full, he presents the appearance of standing somewhat uneasily, with one foot advanced and planted on the instinctive theory, while with the other, as if in deference to considerations which threaten the safety of his new position, he still preserves a foothold on the old ground of the development theory. He announces his divided allegiance to these two theories in the following statement:

"The use of articulate language is a faculty inherent in man. There can be little doubt that a colony of children, reared without hearing words uttered by those around them, would at length form for themselves a speech. It is not improbable that a language of manual signs would precede articulate words."

The same mingling of theories is contained in the following expressions:

"We regard it as a necessary and therefore natural product of intelligent self-conscious organization. . . . But though the faculty of articulate speech may be considered natural to man, it differs from most other human powers, whether organic or incorporeal, in this: that it is a faculty belonging to the race, not to the individual, and that the so-

---

\* *Lectures on the English Language*, pp. 29-40.



cial condition is essential, not to its cultivation, but to its existence. Hence its exercise is not spontaneous, or in any sense self-taught, as are all purely organic processes."

Let us see what is involved in these statements. It is taught, in the first place, that though the faculty of speech is inherent in man, it is not spontaneous, and is so sluggish, and so ill accomplishes the purpose of its existence, as to leave man to grope his way slowly and painfully from a state of mutism through the intermediate use of signs — a doctrine open to the objections just brought against the development theory;— and, in the second place, it is affirmed that what is the *necessary* product of intelligent self-conscious organization, is dependent upon the social condition for its very existence. A theory whose very statement involves self-contradiction, cannot certainly have any very firm basis of truth.

The bolder advocates of the theory, however, avoid these objections by planting themselves fearlessly upon the ground that the faculty of speech not only belongs inherently to man, but is spontaneous and instinctive in its exercise. This position is taken by Prof. Max Müller,\* in the following language:

"Man, in his primitive and perfect state, was not only endowed, like the brute, with the power of expressing his sensations by interjections, and his perceptions by onomatopœia. He possessed likewise the faculty of giving more articulate expression to the rational conceptions of his mind. That faculty was not of his own making. It was an instinct, an instinct of the mind as irresistible as any other instinct."

Again he says:

"The faculty peculiar to man, in his primitive state, by which every impression from without received its vocal expression from within, must be accepted as an ultimate fact. That faculty must have existed in man, because its effects continue to exist."

He again alludes to it as

"The creative faculty which gave to each conception as it thrilled for the first time through the brain, a phonetic expression."

---

\* Lectures on the Science of Language, p. 385.

Dr. Kendrick,\* in his review of Müller's work, endorses his position in the following language :

"Is language an immediate, natural, necessary product of man's peculiar rational constitution? Is rational speech as much the offspring of the higher human organism, as their natural inarticulate cries are of the lower, irrational nature of the brutes? So we firmly believe."

The author of the article on Language, in the new American Cyclopædia, gives in his adhesion to this doctrine as follows :

"Speech, as the necessary function of the human faculties, arose instinctively, and single languages were formed by the peculiar choice or caprice of their speakers, as influenced by various agencies."

It would be difficult to assert more clearly and more positively, than it is done in these passages, the spontaneous and instructive production by man himself of human language. As if to guard against the possibility of misconception, it is treated as entirely analogous to the production, on the part of the inferior animals, of the inarticulate cries peculiar to them: and Prof. Müller still further illustrates the spontaneity and naturalness of this process under the influence of external impressions, by the volumes of sound which a bell flings off in obedience to the hand which rings it. Having made sure of a clear understanding of the doctrine, let us now see how it stands the test of examination.

Whatever is instinctive, the necessary result of the faculties conferred upon us, must necessarily be co-extensive in its existence with the faculties themselves. If articulate speech belongs to man at all, as a product of instinct, it must belong to all men without exception. Its exercise, too, will be as universal as its existence ; for it is the nature of instinct to manifest itself at once and spontaneously whenever the occasion presents itself, and no occasion can ever be wanting for the exercise of human speech. All these manifestations must possess identity of character ; for instinct is subject to no control but that of the irresistible impulse to its own exercise. It obeys this one law of its existence with almost absolute uniformity, uninfluenced by any considerations of judg-

---

\*Christian Review, January, 1863.

ment, choice or caprice. If language were instinctive, there could exist, therefore, no possible basis for the diversity of human speech. Instinct, here as elsewhere, would be invariable in its manifestations. The birds all build their nests, the bees all construct their cells, the beavers all build their dams, without teaching, and in precisely the same way. Why? Because these various acts are the necessary result of the faculties conferred on them respectively. They are the working out of an inexorable law which admits of neither change nor exception. In like manner, if language were instinctive, it would be absurd to speak of teaching it. Infants, at the moment of beholding external objects, would call them by name, and these names would be the same in China as in America. Wherever the true metal might be found, it would prove its genuineness by giving forth the true and uniform *ring*, to borrow the language of Prof. Müller.

But it is perfectly evident that the expressions which we use when speaking of instinct, cannot have the remotest application to the use of human speech. It would require a keen eye to discover any analogy between this and any of the acts above mentioned. Can any one for a moment suppose, in case two companies of children, one in China and one in America, should be reared without hearing any word uttered—admitting, for the mere sake of argument, what is totally improbable—that they would form for themselves any language at all, that their speech would exhibit any of that uniformity which belongs invariably to all the productions of a common instinct? Should we not rather suppose that the two jargons which we have imagined as resulting from this experiment, would be as wide as the poles asunder, both from each other and from either the Chinese or the English?

But let us consult our observation as to the actual character of the process by which language is acquired. No form of human speech was ever known to be acquired in any other way than by imitation, and so far is this acquisition from bordering on the instinctive in its character, that the extreme slowness and difficulty of the process would, on the contrary, naturally suggest that it is wholly artificial. Daily observa-



tion in the case of children shows that, though they are under the pressure of a constant and urgent necessity for some means to make known their wants, it is only by repeated and long-continued persuasion that they are induced to employ their vocal organs for this purpose; and the organs themselves, entirely contrary to what might be expected of them, were speech the natural and necessary exercise of an inherent faculty, betray the utmost reluctance to undertake the task required of them. With as little propriety could the term instinctive be applied to such a process, as to the acquisition of one of the most difficult of the mechanic arts.

But there remains a still more important fact to be mentioned, which, of itself, is sufficient completely to overthrow this theory. This fact is that the absence of the single sense of hearing invariably annihilates the power of articulate speech. Just think of an "irresistible instinct," depending for its very existence upon the stopping or unstopping of the ears! It is preposterous to suppose that there is anything in such an obstacle of a nature to interfere for a moment with the operations of instinct. Prof. Müller's law ought still to hold, that "every impression from without must receive its vocal expression from within." Does any one suppose that the absence of hearing, or even of sight, ever interfered seriously with the operations of instinct in the lower animals. Instinct is proverbially blind, and is dependent upon the senses only as the means of attaining its object. It is not inconceivable, even, that all the senses might depart in succession, and still the instincts remain until life itself should cease.

But the fact that the deaf are always mute, proves not only that language is not instinctive, but also that it is at the farthest possible remove from the instinctive in its character. On what other supposition than that the very idea of articulate speech is foreign to the human mind, and belongs to it only as communicated from without, can we explain the fact that the deaf, of themselves, establish no connection between what are known to us as the organs of speech, and in the communication of their ideas and of course never make any

attempt to use their organs for this purpose. Nay, even after the connection has been suggested to them by daily observation of this mode of communication in others ; after they have learned all that is possible to know of articulate speech without the aid of the sense of hearing ; after they have acquired a sign-language, which they employ with wonderful facility and success, and through this medium furnish abundant evidence of their full and perfect possession of the highest faculties of the human mind ; they are still as far as ever from manifesting any ability to make use of articulate speech. The "irresistible instinct" gives no sign of life. But let us now suppose for a moment that these deaf ears are unstopped, and what will be the result ? We shall, according to the theory we are now considering, witness the unparalleled phenomenon of the birth of an instinct. It is true, the strength with which it will assert itself may not, perhaps, exactly suggest the idea of irresistibility ; but then we must not expect too much of a *young* instinct. By duly nursing and training, stimulating and pushing it, we may hope that it will, in process of time, be brought to imitate tolerably the words which are furnished to it ready-formed ; in other words, that it will attain to a successful repetition of the mechanical process by which the child learns to talk.

What is the conclusion to which all this irresistibly leads us ? It is this, that the sole difference between man with speech, and man without speech, is the ability to hear. Now, the only office which we can conceive the sense of hearing as fulfilling in the case, is to bring the mind into connection with a language already existing. For if a language did not exist upon which the sense of hearing could seize, and which it could furnish to the appropriate organs for their imitation, the possession of this sense could be of no possible service as far as articulate speech is concerned. There would be no sound in nature but those inarticulate sounds which are the only utterances of the brutes, and of all men who have never yet heard a language already existing : and the faculty of hearing could, therefore, furnish no sound to the mind that would suggest the use of the peculiar organs of speech. Those organs would as cer-

tainly and necessarily remain dormant as in the case of the deaf. The reason, and the sole reason, why the deaf are always mute, is that deafness is an insurmountable obstacle in the way of teaching them the use of their vocal organs. The equally insurmountable obstacle furnished by the absence of language, would necessarily produce the same result. It follows, then, that man possesses no inherent power to acquire language in any other way than by imitation. So far as *he* is concerned, it is purely an imitative art, and in no sense a creation.

There is also another important fact which goes to corroborate this position. But few of the words composing any language are radicals. There are not probably over five hundred, at the outside, in the best furnished languages. All the rest are derivatives, formed by modifications or combinations of primitive roots. During the whole period in which it is possible to trace historically the progress of language, there has been no substantial addition to the previously existing stock of primitive words. The inventive genius of man, so remarkable in other things, seems here to have met with an impassable barrier. He has been obliged in his attempts to enrich language, to confine himself entirely to the discovery of new forms of modification and combination of the words already existing. This, it will hardly be denied, is a most remarkable and significant fact. If we suppose the human mind ever to have possessed the power to originate the ground-forms of language, it is not very easy to account for the entire cessation of this power. It would certainly be no more difficult to add to a stock already existing, than to furnish the original supply. This consideration, added to those already presented, leaves no possible way of avoiding the conclusion that man is naturally utterly incapable of originating language. If he had been placed in the world without a language, and left to his own resources to supply himself with one, there is not the slightest reason to believe that he would ever have advanced beyond those cries and ejaculations that we term interjections, which, though found in all languages, properly constitute no part of language, since they have no distinct articulation



and express no definite ideas, but are mere signs of emotion.

Dr. Kendrick is confident in the belief that "*all* the facts and phenomena of language tend irresistibly to the conclusion that it is the immediate and necessary product of man's rational constitution." Out of this implied vast body of unmentioned facts, which all unite to furnish an irresistible support to the instinctive theory, we have ventured to select a few, which, it will not be too much to affirm, do not point very strongly in that direction. We are at liberty, so far at least as any proof to the contrary is concerned, to form from these our judgment as to the character of the remainder.

The position here taken, we are well aware, must be most unwelcome to the pride of the being who takes so much more delight in looking upon himself as the lord than as the creature. This consideration, however, can hardly be said to militate against its truth. It has never been ascertained, we believe, that it is any part of the business of truth to flatter man's pride. On the contrary, so many of the highest and most important truths, both of religion and of science, are directly calculated to humble man in his own estimation, that the fact that a theory has this effect should rather be taken as a consideration in favor of its truthfulness; while theories of an opposite tendency ought to be inspected with great care, and some degree of suspicion, from their liability to be estimated and adopted on other grounds than their intrinsic merits.

It must not be understood that there is any intention in what has been said to deny the very intimate relation between language and thought. That, indeed, there is no necessary connection between them, in the sense that thought cannot exist without language, has, we think, been abundantly proved. But the importance of articulate speech to the full development of man's highest faculties can hardly be overstated. The denial of man's ability to originate language, by no means derogates from this importance. It simply requires that man, instead of taking credit to himself, in any way, for the incalculable blessing which he enjoys in the possession of

articulate speech, and thus making it a subject of proud self-congratulation, should, with bowed head and grateful heart, add to it the already untold number of rich gifts which he owes to Divine munificence.

It will not be amiss, before leaving this point, to strengthen the view here taken of the unsoundness of the instinctive theory, by noticing some of the inconsistencies in which it involves its advocates. For it is scarcely conceivable that, in the hands of such able defenders, such inconsistencies can properly be regarded in any other light than as inseparable consequences of the theory itself.

Side by side with his theory of the origin of language, Prof. Müller unfolds his doctrine of roots. "The fact," says he, "that every word is originally a predicate; that names, though signs of individual conceptions, are all, without exception, derived from general ideas; is one of the most important discoveries of the science of language. It was known before, that language is the distinguishing characteristic of man; it was known also that the having of general ideas is that which puts a perfect distinction between man and brutes; but that these two were only different expressions of the same fact was not known till the theory of roots had been established. . . . All naming is classification, bringing the individual under the general. . . . In order to call the first hollow *cavea* it was necessary that the general idea of *hollow* should have been formed in the mind. Nay, we may go a step beyond, for *cavea*, or hollow, is a secondary, not a primary, idea. Before a cave was called *cavea*, a hollow thing, many things hollow had passed before the eyes of men."

The question will at once arise in the mind of one who has just read Prof. Müller's theory of the origin of language, what the "irresistible instinct" was doing while these observations were going on—while the mind was slowly gathering the materials for the formation of that general idea which must precede the giving of the name. It will be perceived that the position here announced is, that language is the result of an extended generalization; nay, that each single word is but the result of such a generalization—the product of one of

the highest and most difficult operations of human reason. Now it is well known that the mind, even when most cultivated by the long-continued use of articulate speech, performs this work of generalization with exceeding slowness. An illustration of this is furnished in the slow growth of the natural sciences. It has required ages to generalize the facts and phenomena which fall under our daily observation. And yet it would be safe to say that if the theory is correct that all naming is classification performed by man himself, the production of human language must have made a more exhaustive draught on the exercise of this power than the rearing of all the scientific structures to which we point as the proud monuments of centuries of intellectual toil. If we should calculate the time which would thus be required to create human language even at the highest rate of generalization on other subjects, we should, to a certainty, have man still digging at the primitive roots, and probably at no very advanced stage of his labor. But if we assume, as the basis of our estimate, the rate at which, during the last three thousand years, he has been making his generalizations in this field, and thus making additions to his previous stock of roots, the case is a still more hopeless one. Man would now be making the best use he could of a vocabulary of interjections. And yet it is this process—this slow and minute observation of particular facts and phenomena, and the final arrival thereby at general ideas; in a word, it is inductive reasoning—that we are soberly called upon to believe is the work of instinct;—a mental instinct, if you choose, but yet an instinct, “as irresistible as any other instinct.” The simple words which we have hitherto used so thoughtlessly as things which we might safely handle, suddenly assume a strangely hybrid, perhaps even Gorgonic character; each word swells into the proportions of an *embodied instinct in abstraction!* It is by means of a theory of language which thus confounds things totally opposite, that Prof. Müller claims to make a much mystified matter very clear, and to avoid that sum of all evils, a resort to supernatural agency. Surely one who should see such inconsistencies staring him in the face, might be



excused for taking refuge in almost any theory which would furnish him an escape.

Dr. Kendrick, too, in what we must regard as a good-natured acquiescence in the untested theory of another, by his double endorsement of Müller, both in his theory of the origin of language and in his theory of roots, not only involves himself in the unaccountable inconsistency just noticed, but also in one which must be allowed to be peculiarly his own. He adduces as proof that language is the necessary product of man's rational constitution, "that law of the human mind which makes it an almost utter, if not an absolute impossibility to pursue any extended process of thought, to perform any act of generalization, and hold together any set of complex ideas, without the aid of language." He then proceeds immediately to endorse Müller's theory of roots. If now we put these two positions in the form of the two premises of a syllogism, and draw the conclusion, the whole will stand thus: It is a law of the human mind that it can perform no act of generalization, without the aid of language. No single word was ever produced by man, except as the result of a previous act of generalization. Therefore no single word was ever produced by man. A valid syllogism, whose conclusion *we* have no disposition to deny, but whether it can consistently be held in connection with the instinctive theory, is too delicate a question to decide.

We come now to the statement of the third theory of the origin of language. If it is true, as we have attempted to show, that man is naturally incapable of originating language, there is but one other source to which we can ascribe its existence. We must suppose that here, as elsewhere, the Maker of man has supplemented man's imperfection, and made such provision for the highest development of his faculties as was beyond the power of man to supply for himself. It is difficult to perceive any reason for objecting to the application here of a universal principle of God's providence. The repugnance which many of the opposers of this theory seem to feel to the admission of supernatural aid—or interference, as they choose to style it—may with the same reason be felt against the supposition of Divine

agency in any of the affairs of men. If we draw our inferences as to what is antecedently probable in this case, not from what we may, in a spirit of pride and self-love, consider desirable, but from observation of God's established mode of dealing with men, we shall find ourselves, not only divested of all objections to this theory, but prepared to find in it the true solution of the question in hand.

There are two great demands which must be satisfied by any theory which can permanently claim our assent. In the first place, it must provide for the existence of language from the very earliest period of man's existence. As we have before seen, the perfection of man in his primitive state presupposes all the conditions most favorable to the action of the mental faculties, and first among these conditions is the possession of articulate speech. This first requirement all development theories must necessarily fail to meet. There can be only one theory, based on the supposition that man is the author of language, which will answer this demand. The instinctive theory, by furnishing man with the power to produce language spontaneously, however objectionable on other grounds, frees itself from any charge of failure in this particular. Indeed, this theory would seem to have been framed under the pressure of a two-fold necessity; first, the necessity, arising from the constitution of the human mind and from man's original perfection, of putting man in immediate possession of language; and, secondly, an imaginary necessity, existing only in the minds of its framers, of avoiding a resort to supernatural agency.

But there is a second and real necessity which this theory, even if it were tenable in other respects, utterly fails to satisfy. This necessity is found in the fact, which Prof. Müller pronounces one of the most important discoveries of the science of language, and which we are not disposed to question, that every primitive word stands as the representative of a general idea; that language is really a vast system of classification, the result necessarily of a series of generalizations, vast in extent, number and variety. As every one will perceive at once, the instinctive theory not only fails to explain

this fact, but is utterly and hopelessly inconsistent with it. The only way in which we can conceive that man could have spontaneously produced a language, every word of which bears record to vast antecedent intellectual processes, is by the admission of that supernatural agency which it is the special object of this theory to exclude.

But it is just here that we touch upon the true ground. We must have a theory which shall seize and harmonize these two facts, between which the instinctive theory is crushed in pieces; the fact, first, that language was produced immediately on the creation of man; and the fact, secondly, that it is, on proof furnished by itself, the result of abstract reasoning employed with a power and to an extent beyond our power to calculate. Divine agency alone will bridge the chasm. Here, and here alone, we have a cause adequate to the effect. Even before the discovery of the true nature of roots, the existence of language was an effect, the greatness of which was sufficient to make us doubt the adequacy of mere human agency to produce it; but this discovery renders imperative the necessity of calling in Divine aid. The theory of the Divine origin of language furnishes a rational explanation of all the facts and phenomena of language, and is sufficient to meet all the demands that can be made upon it; a statement which cannot truthfully be made of any other theory.

It remains to state in brief what we regard as the probable facts in relation to the origin of language. Man, when he was created and placed in the midst of the other works of God to be their lord, was no doubt miraculously endowed with the power to call all things which he saw by their names, and to pronounce all those words which are necessary to form the framework of human speech. These names and words, on the supposition of their Divine origin, we can consistently admit to be what they really appear—the signs of general ideas. We shall not be reduced to the necessity, laid upon the advocates of the instinctive theory, of regarding them as the signs of human ideas such as could by no possibility have arisen before the origin of language. We have only to accept them as signs of Divine ideas, and suppose that, as the human



soul was formed in the image of the Divine nature, so was human language formed in the image of Divine ideas; both impressions, indeed, overlaid and obscured by human additions, but still there in lines that can be clearly traced; the Divine nature and the Divine idea, the crowning glories, the one of man himself, the other of human speech.

It is not necessary to assume that man was furnished with a fully developed language. On the contrary, it is more natural to suppose that God, here as elsewhere, supplied only what was beyond the reach of the human mind, and left whatever fell within the scope of its faculties for its own development. There are two facts which the science of language has found standing side by side, which may point out to us the true boundary line between the divine and human elements in human speech. Man has exhibited, on the one hand, a remarkable power of modifying and combining primitive roots and in this way adding to his store of words, and, on the other hand, a still more remarkable want of power to invent any new roots. Here then is the dividing line. It is man's province to modify and combine; it is God's prerogative to create. This combining and multiplying power, conspicuous even yet, we may well suppose existed in a much higher degree when man was in the full vigor of his newly created and untainted manhood, and when, in addition to all the inspiring and invigorating influences of an uncursed earth, he stood in immediate communion with his unoffended Creator, and drank in constant draughts of divine energy from the Great Source of all life, intellectual as well as physical. Language, furnished in its elements by the Creator himself, and subjected to the moulding influence of a mind which had but just been exhaled from the Divine Spirit, would rapidly, and as if by a spontaneous impulse, build itself up into a fit instrument for the intercourse of the pure beings whose language made vocal the only paradise that earth has ever known.

We can hardly forbear, in closing the discussion of this subject, to refer to three leading tendencies of thought as illustrated by the three theories of language which we have been

considering. These diverse tendencies manifest themselves prominently wherever the question of divine agency is involved. The first of these tendencies is seen in the adoption of those theories of science which, in accounting for the effects which fall under our observation, admit the entire exclusion of God from the universe. It shows a special partiality for development theories — their peculiar recommendation being, that, by an infinite retrogressive series, they conveniently reduce the most wonderful of effects to the requirements of the most infinitesimal of causes, or do away with the necessity of any cause at all.

The second of these intellectual tendencies manifests itself somewhat differently. Under the influence of the first tendency, men seem determined to deny God, even at the expense of degrading man. Under the influence of the second, they are determined to elevate man, even at the expense of ignoring God. While admitting the existence and power of the Supreme Being, they appear to conceive of him as having constructed and set in motion the complicated mechanism of the universe, secured it against all possibility of derangement in its operations, and then, as having, in some sense, abdicated his sovereignty in favor of man, and retired to an immeasurable distance, where he is now wrapped in a sort of dreamy indifference, alike to his works in general, and to him whom he has appointed his vice-gerent. They still further exclude God from view by raising up between him and his works a wall of abstractions, such as Nature and Law. He is thus too far removed, and has too little to do with the administration of affairs to call for any further recognition than an occasional and distant allusion. Much is said, however, of the supreme dignity of human nature, and the god-like powers of the human mind. An engrossing spirit of self-sufficiency and independence of God leads to the semi-deification of man. It is apparently by way of enhancing man's innate dignity, by freeing him as far as possible from any interference and control of a higher being, that all theories which assume the necessity of any such interference are so uniformly and even contemptuously rejected. We are gravely

reminded of the importance of keeping science and religion entirely distinct from each other. Religion is a very good thing in itself, but can act only as a disturbing element when allowed to influence in any way scientific inquiry. This tendency of thought, as one may at once see, unless carefully guarded, might easily degenerate into the one first mentioned. It is only necessary to shut one's eyes for a sufficiently long time, and with sufficient persistency, to the signs of God's active participation in the affairs of this world, in order finally to arrive at a practical denial of his existence. And yet it would perhaps not be wide of the mark to say, that this is the prevailing tendency among the scientific men of the present day. The current sets so strongly in this direction that one who firmly opposes it risks the imputation, either of illiberality, in bringing his religious notions to bear on scientific questions, and of thus being destitute of that catholicity of mind which is demanded of the true scholar, or of being blindly wedded to old and exploded opinions, and of having failed to imbibe the progressive spirit of modern scholarship. Such considerations, no doubt, have brought men of far different general tendencies of mind to yield a tacit assent to theories which have little else to recommend them than the fact that they are boldly and plausibly maintained by men whose pretensions to scholarship are too high to be generally questioned.

The third tendency of thought is separated by a broad line from both of those which have been mentioned. It leads the mind reverently to recognize God as an ever-present and controlling power — as all and in all; to find man's highest dignity and honor, not in his independence of God, but in the relation in which he stands to God as mysteriously joined with him in carrying out the same purposes, and to regard the human will as attaining its highest freedom and development when acting in unison with the Divine will, and in a manner swallowed up in it. Under the influence of this tendency, the mind conceives of God as actively present in every effect in nature, and is persuaded that even in those effects which seem due solely to human agency, the divine element, though an unknown, is nevertheless a real quantity, the neglect of



which in the solution of scientific problems will be sure to vitiate the result.

Which of these tendencies of mind is best calculated to fit man for successful scientific investigation, — which is most likely to bring his eye into that line of vision which leads directly to God and to truth, can scarcely be a matter of question.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.—SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOSAIC TABERNACLE AND WORSHIP.

---

[BY REV. DAVID B. FORD, HANOVER, MASS.]

---

MOSES, in constructing the Tabernacle, was commanded to "make all things according to the pattern showed to him in the mount." In the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews we are taught that the tabernacle and its sacred utensils were "figures of the true," and "copies of things in heaven," and that certain acts of the priesthood were designed of the Holy Spirit to be significant of important spiritual truths. Since, then, there is a Divine significance in the Mosaic Tabernacle, its vessels and its service, we may, perhaps, with profit devote a few pages to their consideration.

The tabernacle, though a small, movable, tent-like structure, was yet exceedingly costly and magnificent. Its value has been estimated at something over one million of dollars. (See Bush on Ex. xxxviii: 24-29.) It was, however, a free-will offering to God from a grateful people. For Moses merely said to the people: "Whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring an offering unto the Lord," and shortly after it was reported to him that "the people bring much more than enough," and in consequence of this he made proclamation throughout the camp

that "neither man nor woman should make any more work for the offering of the sanctuary. So the people were *restrained* from bringing." In this matter of contributing voluntarily and cheerfully for the Lord's house and worship they exhibited a spirit as commendable as it is rare. For certainly the ministers of God are not now often called to *restrain* their people from bringing!

We know but little of the external history and fate of this divine structure. It would seem that after the Israelites had settled in Palestine the Tabernacle was set up in Gilgal and in Shiloh, and, after remaining there for some time, was conveyed to Nob and to Gibeon, and was finally removed by Solomon to Jerusalem, from which time it disappears from sacred history. The temple, however, was closely modelled after the pattern of the tabernacle, so that the tabernacle really survived in the temple, and the usages and service of the former were continued in the latter.

The tabernacle, as set up in the wilderness, was enclosed in an open court or square, about one hundred and fifty feet in length, and seventy-five in width. This court was surrounded on all sides with curtains, which were suspended from silver rods fastened into the columns. These columns stood on bases of brass, and were supported by cords which were fastened to stakes. Hence, perhaps, the language of the prophet: "Enlarge the place of thy tent and stretch forth the curtains of thy habitations; spare not, *lengthen thy cord and strengthen thy stakes.*" (Is. liv: 2.) Within this enclosure and beneath the open sky was the meeting-place of the people, and the place of sacrifice. Let us, in imagination, enter within this enclosure, for here admission is granted even to the Gentiles. The entrance is on the east side, and the tapestry, or figured curtains which guard the entrance-way, are now drawn up. On entering within, the first object which meets our gaze is the brazen altar, or altar of burnt offerings; on this altar is burning the fire which at first came out from before the Lord, and which, therefore, is never suffered to go out. (Lev ix: 24, vi: 13.) By the side of this altar all the sacrifices are performed; from its top there arises, almost unceasingly, a thick smoky cloud,

from the burning flesh, and its walls and its horns are almost constantly moistened with blood. The number of animals annually required by the law, as stated sacrifices for the whole nation, was one thousand two hundred and eighty-nine, and this was exclusive of private offerings, which were by far the most numerous.\* Why were the courts of the Lord made so closely to resemble a slaughter house, and why was this seemingly prodigal waste of innocent blood ordered and sanctioned by Jehovah? These questions can, we think, be answered only on the supposition that these sacrifices were designed of God to teach the guilt and desert of sin, and to point out the way of pardon and remission through the "shedding of blood," even of that blood which "cleanseth from *all* sin."

Immediately beyond the altar of burnt offering, in the open court, is the brazen laver, for the ablutions of the priests, "that they die not" in the performance of their holy service. The brazen altar and the brazen laver, both standing before the entrance of the sanctuary, plainly show our need of pardon through the blood of atonement, and of the washing of regeneration, before we can gain admittance within the heavenly temple.

In the distance, at the west end of the enclosure, we behold the tabernacle, a structure about forty-five feet long, fifteen wide and fifteen high. It looks like a flat square tent, and

---

\* The following summary we quote from Nevin's Biblical Antiquities :

	B.	R.	L.	G.
Daily Sacrifices for 365 days,	00	00	730	00
Sacrifices for 52 Sabbaths (additional),	00	00	104	00
"    for 12 new moons,	24	12	84	12
"    for the Passover (seven days),	14	7	50	7
"    for the Pentecost,	3	3	16	2
"    for the Feast of Trumpets,	1	1	7	1
"    for the day of Atonement,	1	2	7	2
"    for the Feast of Tabernacles (8 days),	71	15	105	8
Total,	114	40	1103	32

Or, one hundred and fourteen Bullocks, forty Rams, eleven hundred and three Lambs, and thirty-two Goats. Making one thousand two hundred and eighty-nine in all.



yet is extremely rich and dazzling in appearance. That is Jehovah's dwelling place—the palace of the King and Lawgiver of the Jewish people ; but so holy is his house and presence that none but priests, the anointed sons of Aaron, are permitted to enter. Thus debarred, as were the people, from the tabernacle, and from any near approach to Jehovah's presence, how forcibly must they have been taught that their iniquities had separated between themselves and God, and their sins had hid from their sight the face of Jehovah.

We are now standing by the altar of burnt offerings, and beneath the open sky. An Israelite comes to offer sacrifice, leading his victim, a domestic animal, by his side. In thus offering the support of the offerer's life, he appeared, as Witsius remarks, to offer that life itself. Death is ever the accompaniment, the desert, the wages of sin, and in this truth consists the very idea of sacrifice. In every offering there is presupposed, on the part of the offerer, both the fact and the consciousness of sin, guilt, estrangement from God, condemnation and desert of death. Thus the man himself, on account of his sins, deserves to die ; but through the divine clemency he is permitted to offer as a substitute the blood of a spotless animal. This innocent victim symbolizes "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of world," and whose blood "cleanseth from all sin." The offerer now places his hands upon the head of the victim, confessing his sins and putting them, as it were, on the head of the animal.\* (Lev. xvi: 21.) So Christ, the spotless Lamb of God, "bore our sins in his own body on the tree," for "on Him was laid the iniquity of us all." After the imposition of hands the offerer proceeds himself to slay the victim, thus signifying that his own sins have caused that death which he inflicts upon another as his substitute. And, as he gazes upon that animal, writhing in

---

\* During the act, the offerer, according to the Rabbinic tradition, made the following confession: "I beseech Thee, O Lord. I have sinned, I have done perversely, I have rebelled, I have done this and that, but now I repent, and let this victim be my expiation." It is also a note-worthy fact in this connection, that the Hebrew terms for sin-offering and trespass-offering properly signify *sin* and *trespass*.

death's agonies as a sacrifice for sin, how naturally would he be reminded of his own desert in the words: "*Thou shalt surely die.*"

The priest, standing by, now receives in a vessel the blood of the animal, and sprinkles it round about upon the altar. The blood has already, in *death*, paid the penalty of sin, and is thereafter esteemed pure and holy, and hence may be sprinkled even on the most holy vessels of the tabernacle. This sprinkling of blood denotes the completion of the expiative act on the part of man, and the acceptance of the same on the part of God. In the meantime the offerer, or some one in his stead, cuts in pieces the body of the victim (just as our Saviour's body was broken on the tree by us and for us), and the priests then take these several parts, salt them, and, with the exception of the skin, burn them all on the altar with fire. This is a *whole* burnt offering, an offering made by fire—of a sweet savor unto the Lord. So should *all* our powers of body, mind and soul be consecrated to God's service, and be wholly laid on his altar as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to Him.

In the case of sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, with which was connected a higher degree of expiation, the management was slightly different. (Lev. iv.–vi.) Only the fat and best parts of the animal were burned. The remainder was either to be eaten by the priests,\* in *peace-offerings*, by the priests

---

\* On the purport of this act, Kurtz, in his *Mosaic Offering*, makes the following remarks: "Although we cannot, with Deyling, regard the eating as a symbolical *incorporatio peccati*, yet we must consider it an *incorporatio sacrificii*. The relation of the eating to the priestly efficacy of the atonement, is, from the above passage (Lev. x:17) undeniable, and this can be explained only on the ground that, by this act was represented an intimate connection of the priest, on the one hand, with the offering, and therefore with the offerer for whom it was presented as a substitute; and on the other hand with Jehovah, to whom the whole offering belonged, and should have been given up in the fire, but who was satisfied with the fat portions as the best, and gave the remainder to the priest. The relation of the sacrificial animal to the offerer was expressed by the imposition of hands, as the same to Jehovah was signified by the burning of the best portions, and both these relations were expressed by the priest in his eating of the remaining flesh." Baehr, in his *Symbology of the Mosaic Cultus*, in substantial agreement with Kurtz, also

and offerers, or, in case the blood was brought into the tabernacle, to be carried without the camp unto a clean place and burned. (Lev. vi : 26-30.) "Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." In sin-offerings, moreover, the priests not only sprinkled the brazen altar, or, as a higher expiation, besmeared its *horns*, which are the insignia of the altar, and in which its meaning and power are concentrated ; but also, on certain occasions, took a part of the blood and carried it within the tabernacle into the holy place, and once a year, on the great day of atonement, entered into the most holy place, and sprinkled the altar-like vessels there.

We have said that only the priests, the sons of Aaron, were permitted to enter within the tabernacle. How, then, can we, gentile strangers, gain admittance there? We answer, that through Christ and the vail of his flesh a new and living way has been freely opened for all who believe in his name. Therefore, taking the shoes from off our feet, and "having our bodies washed with pure water," and putting on the robes of holiness, let us who are now, through Christ, "made kings and *priests* unto God," enter within the tabernacle—the dwelling place of Jehovah's glory.

The interior of the tabernacle, as we have already intimated, is divided into two apartments, the holy place and the most holy; the former occupying about two thirds of the whole space. Its walls were composed of forty-eight perpendicular planks, overlaid with gold, and resting on silver bases. Four different coverings, or curtains, are spread over and shield this whole structure, protecting it from the weather, and excluding every ray of light from without. Entering now within the holy place, or outer tabernacle, our attention is first directed to the golden candlestick at our left, from whose lamps, seven in number, issues forth a "dim religious light," by which we are enabled to see where we are and what is about us. We are

---

remarks: "In the eating of the most holy offering in the holy place, the priests appear in the closest connection and communion both with the offering and with Him from whom all holiness proceeds, and whose instruments they are, with Jehovah."



now within the peculiar dwelling place of the priesthood, the *ideal* residence of the people of God, who are themselves "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," but who yet, through their relative imperfection of development and attainment, are not permitted at present to occupy this holy place except in the persons of their representatives, the priests. As the most holy place teaches what God is to his people—even a merciful God and atoning Saviour—so this holy place teaches what the people must be before God, in order to be his people and to dwell with Him. They must be a prepared and holy people—a people of light, of prayer, and of good works. Hence, in this apartment, we discover three vessels, the golden candelabrum on our left, the table of shew-bread on our right, and the golden altar, or altar of incense, between the two, though somewhat nearer to the "second vail," and these objects are symbols of the people of God. The lamps were supplied with beaten olive oil, the emblem of God's spirit and grace in the heart, and they probably were kept burning night and day without intermission. The golden altar sends forth each morning and evening its incense of sweet perfume, which is an emblem of the prayers of the saints. The table proffers its gifts, its twelve loaves of unleavened shew-bread or bread of presence, emblematical of the good works which the true spiritual Israel present before God.\* Into this apartment came the priests daily, morning and evening (Num. xxviii : 3-9), and at other times to attend to the lamps and the table, to offer incense, and in case of sin-offering and trespass-offerings of the high priest and of the whole congregation, to besmear with blood the horns of the golden altar, and also to sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord or towards the most holy place. Thus, truly, "almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without the shedding of blood is no remission."

But we have not yet noticed the covering over our heads.

---

\* For a fuller discussion of this, and of several other topics which have passed under our notice, see an article translated by the writer from the German of Kurtz, entitled the *Sin-Offering*, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1852.

On looking up we perceive it to be a curtain of tapestry made of fine twined linen, of blue and purple and scarlet; and inwrought in its texture are cherubim of cunning work. In heaven the holy cherubim and the rapt seraphim are Jehovah's constant attendants, and they cry one to another, day and night, continually, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts."

But the tabernacle has a second and inner apartment, which is called the holy of holies, or the holiest of all. A vail separates the holy from the most holy place: the way into the holiest of all was not then made manifest. How dare we lift up this vail and enter within, when we read that thither "went the high priest alone, once every year, not without blood." Even the priests and Levites, should they venture within, may not hope to come out alive. But, recollecting that the vail of the temple at our Lord's crucifixion "was rent in twain from the top to the bottom," thus giving free access to the holy of holies, and that our Lord himself has opened for us "a new and living way," we may have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus." But within there is no candelabrum to give us light, and not a ray of sunlight can enter. How, then, can aught within be seen? But in heaven there is needed neither the light of the sun nor of the moon, for the glory of God, and the Lamb, are the light thereof. Heaven is lighted up from within. Now, the holy of holies is God's peculiar dwelling place, the heaven of his manifested presence and glory among men. And his glory, the Shekinah, is the light of the most holy place. But Moses, on the mount, could not endure the sight of God's manifested presence and glory. No man could see it and live. Even the Israelites could not endure the reflected glory which shone from the face of Moses when he came down from the mount, and therefore he veiled his face when speaking to the people. Let, then, the high priest, clad in robes of white, and bearing on his mitre the inscription: "HOLINESS TO JEHOVAH," pass in before us and sprinkle, as on the day of atonement, seven times with blood the mercy-seat, and let a cloud of incense fill the place, and obscure in some measure that insufferable brightness, lest both he and

ourselves be consumed. The high priest bears on each shoulder an onyx-stone, and upon his heart a breast-plate or pectoral, on which are inscribed the names of the twelve tribes for whom he makes intercession. So Christ, our great and merciful High Priest and Intercessor, bears upon his heart our poor and worthless names, and has "entered not into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."

The only vessel within the holy of holies is the ark of the covenant or testimony. In this ark are found the golden pot of manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the two stone tablets, or tables of the covenant, which give to the ark its name. The tables of the ten commandments or testimony testify *against* the sins of the people. (Deut. xxxi: 26, 27.) But these testifying and condemning tables are covered with a propitiatory covering, the so-called mercy-seat, made of solid beaten gold, covering the whole ark, and thus hiding, as it were, our sins from the face of Jehovah. The name of this covering is, in the New Testament, applied twice to the Saviour, thus showing that he is our covering, "the *propitiation* for our sins," "whom God hath set forth to be a *propitiation* through faith in his blood." Standing on either end of this propitiatory covering, are two golden cherubim of glory, overshadowing with their wings the mercy-seat, and gazing thereupon as if with intensest feelings of adoration and praise. These cherubim, like the four living creatures or cherubim of Ezekiel, and of the Apocalypse, are representatives of the most perfect creature-life, of the highest intelligences redeemed and glorified, and thus, with their faces bowed down they adore the grace and holiness of Jehovah.\* And finally, between the two cherubim and over the mercy-seat, is the cloud of glory, the Shekinah, the manifested presence of Jehovah! "And there will I meet with thee," was the language of Jehovah unto Moses, "and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim."

---

\* See an article on the *Cherubim*, translated from the German of Baehr, by the Rev. A. Hovey, in No. LVIII. of the Christian Review.



Hence the language of the Psalmist : " O, thou, who dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth."

And now we are gazing upon the ark of the covenant—the glory of the tabernacle and of the first temple. We are gazing upon that ark at the sight of which the waters fled and Jordan parted its waves. " What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest, and thou, Jordan, that thou wast driven back? Ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams and ye little hills like lambs?" At the sight of this ark the walls of Jericho fell down and the city was taken. Falling into the hands of the Philistines, it was set up in the house of Dagon, but the idol-god fell upon its face before it, and was broken to pieces. The men of Bethshemesh irreverently looked into the ark of the Lord, and over 50,000 of the people were smitten with death. Uzzah incautiously, but with seeming good intent, put forth his hand to the ark to steady it, but for this he was smitten, and there he died by the ark of God. Not even the Levites could look thereon and live. Let not thy presence, O Jehovah, be to us as " a consuming fire," but may it be the light, the life and the joy of our souls forever.

The ark continued in existence about a thousand years, till the destruction of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar. Whether it was then burnt, or carried to Babylon and destroyed, or what became of it, no one can tell. Many of the Jews still believe it is somewhere concealed, and that when the Messiah comes he will disclose its hiding place. Vain hopes ; for the Messiah has already come, and hath once been " offered to bear the sins of many," hath once, in the end of the world, appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." Therefore the sacrificial and ceremonial services, which were but a shadow of good things to come, have ceased, and the ark of God, the tabernacle and the temple, are no more. The many priests and the many sacrifices with their manifold imperfections have given place to the one High Priest, the one Great Sacrifice, the one ever-living Intercessor. " For Christ, because he continueth forever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for

them. For such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests," themselves encompassed with infirmity, "to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the people's; for this He did ONCE, WHEN HE OFFERED UP HIMSELF."

---

---

#### ARTICLE V.—INFANT SALVATION.

---

[BY REV. H. C. TOWNLEY, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.]

---

THERE are few afflictions more heavy than those occasioned by the death of infant children. It touches the finer issues of our nature, when the invading chill stops the beating of these little hearts. We feel the reality of death most keenly; we realize its burthens as never before, when we gaze upon the marble features of a child whose little feet have gone down into the dark valley.

And yet how many pass through this mournful experience every day! To how many families, in every neighborhood, does the chain of events which makes up the circling years bring round its broken links! Carefully collected statistics prove that more than one third, and perhaps one half of the human family die in infancy. And considering the prevalence of infanticide in heathen lands, the number last named appears not too great.

A fact like this may well awaken our liveliest interest, and spring an anxious question respecting the final destiny of the infant dead. This unnumbered throng, swept away from earth's successive millions—whither have they gone?—where

are they to-day?—is it well with them for eternity? These are more than speculations.

Gathering them into a single inquiry, we propose in this article to treat the following question:—ARE ALL SAVED WHO DIE IN INFANCY?

The answers given by theological writers, both ancient and modern, have been various, and often contradictory. In the absence of a more full revelation, and upon a subject far removed from the legitimate sphere of philosophy, men have doubted, guessed, attempted to reason where reason was impossible, hazarded assertions the most reckless and painful, assumed relations where none existed, and often extinguished the light which they might have derived from the Bible, in their vain search after that which it was impossible to secure. And inasmuch as many of the views early expressed upon this question find their advocates in the present day, it is important that we furnish successively:

I. A BRIEF HISTORY AND REVIEW OF THE LEADING OPINIONS UPON THE DOCTRINE OF INFANT SALVATION.

Very early in the history of Christianity it was believed and affirmed, that *the souls of baptized infants were saved, and all others were barred from the blessings of heaven.* As far back as the writings of Clement of Alexandria, we find a strong tendency to confound the ordinances of Christ with the salvation they symbolized. This error, especially prevalent among the semi-gnostic theologians, soon took form in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and developed a general belief that, to be saved, infants must be baptized. It was argued that, since baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation, unbaptized infants are excluded from its benefits. For a time this view was cautiously expressed; for while nearly all seem anxious enough to accept its consequences in respect to baptized infants, there was not so general an agreement in respect to those who died unbaptized. There was evidently a greater unanimity in sending the former class to heaven, than in consigning all the latter to hell. At length, however, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, with all its logical consequences, received a bold and unequivocal state-



ment from the pen of Augustine. Having accepted the premises upon which it was based, such were his views of original sin, and such the logical vigor of his mind, that he not only taught that baptism is the only medium of salvation, but also that eternal reprobation is the fate of all who die without it. This he affirmed was the belief of all true Catholics. To use his own words: "*Noli credere, noli dicere, noli docere, infantes antequam baptizentur morte praevenitos, prevenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam peccatorum, si vis esse catholicus.*"\* "*Omnino in remissionem peccatorum baptizantur et parvuli, alioquin non habebunt in regno coelorum vitam.*"† Various modifying theories were proposed to smooth the harshness of this opinion. Some supposed that there might be an intermediate state for infants dying unbaptized, and some were bold enough to teach that all such were annihilated. But the views of Augustine prevailed, and the final perdition of all infants dying unbaptized, became the doctrine of the Catholic Church. This belief, however, appears to have been modified by the doctrine of purgatory, and the souls of infants who had been either baptized improperly, or not at all, were supposed to go, not into hell itself, but into a "*Limbus Infantum*," where they continued a kind of negative existence, free from pain or happiness. Martin, in his "*La Via Futura*,"‡ has given the names of several Roman Catholic Doctors who held that the final state of those infants who are excluded from heaven is painless.

With this modification, the doctrine of Infant Salvation held by the Romanist to-day is the same as that taught by Augustine and his associates. Dr. I. Perrone, the highest living authority upon questions of Roman Catholic theology, has given the belief of his Church upon this point in language fully according with the celebrated Bishop of Hippo. In his manual of theology he lays down and treats at length the

---

\* De Anima et ejus Orig., lib. 3. chap. 9.

† Con. Pel., lib. 5.

‡ 2nd ed. Paris, 1853, pp. 439—455.

following proposition: "*Infantes ex hac via sine baptismo decedentes, ad aeternam salutem pervenire non possunt.*"\* Such a statement, from such a man, fixes, beyond a question, the faith of the Roman Church upon the subject under review.

After the Reformation, the necessity of baptism to the salvation of infants was advocated by Protestants under two distinct phases. Baptismal regeneration was embodied in the liturgy of the Church of England, and gave rise to two parties; the one rejecting the reprobation of infants altogether, and the other holding that those who die unbaptized are condemned to a painless banishment from heaven. It is not very easy to see how the first of these opinions can be harmonized with the teachings of the Prayer Book; but harmony is not an element of Episcopal theology. Even the High Churchmen have not defined their position upon this subject with clearness. If, however, a creed in which consistency is the exception, and not the rule, can be held responsible for anything, the Protestant Episcopal Church may be justly charged with denying salvation to unbaptized infants. For, if an infant is *made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,*" in baptism, it is difficult to say why he was not an alien before, and, dying in this condition, why he would not reap an alien's reward.

Other and respectable Protestant communions have urged the necessity of baptism to the salvation of infants on an entirely different ground. They tell us that, though baptism is *not* the channel of salvation, it *is* the seal of the Abrahamic Covenant; and inasmuch as only those infants are saved who are embraced by that covenant and sealed with its seal, to be saved, infants must be baptized. This sentiment clearly implies the condemnation of those infants who die without this hallowed inclosure, or not having that warrant which secures its benefits. This consequence, it is true, will not be confessed by many who have baptized the Abrahamic Cove-

---

\* Paris, 1842, pp. 878-879.

nant, and then made it authority for baptizing infants ; but this is because they are more evangelical than their standards.

From what has been said, it will be seen that the teachings of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Episcopal Churches, and of those who confound the Covenant of Abraham with the covenant of grace, and make baptism its seal, agree in claiming the necessity of baptism to the salvation of the early dead. And though the converse of this proposition is often stated with caution, and sometimes entirely omitted, the inference is unavoidable, that those unbaptized are eternally lost.

But, though supported by a long line of illustrious names, this opinion is unauthorized by a single warrant of Scripture, and may serve to show how early and how frequently the stream of truth has been rendered muddy and filthy by the offals of the Man of Sin. The root from which this rank upas sprang, and from which it drew its life while spreading its branches until they overshadowed the broad extent of nominal Christendom, would upheave and overturn the whole tenor of New Testament teaching. The Scriptures distinctly declare that the ever blessed Spirit, and not the waters of baptism, regenerate the soul : that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son," and no ordinance whatsoever, "cleanseth from all sin." Surely, if a few drops of water sprinkled upon the flesh ; if the body buried beneath the waves of baptism ; if *any* outward rite, or covenant, or seal, could give salvation to the death-struck soul of man, Christ might have been spared his lowly incarnation, the agony of the garden, and the cruel anguish of the cross. If an infant, without actual sin, and despite the atonement of Christ, is doomed to eternal destruction, no mere ceremony can turn aside that doom, and call down those clouds of wrath in endless showers of mercy.

A *second* leading opinion upon the subject before us is, that *all infants are saved because all are innocent*. It is impossible to fix the exact date when this view began to be taught. There is evidence in the writings of the earliest fathers, that they entertained diminutive notions of original



sin, and attached little importance to the natural guilt of infants. Those of the East, especially, appear to have deviated widely from the third chapter of Romans; and even Augustine himself, in his earlier writings, betrayed a lenity upon this point which contrasts boldly with his later teachings. Pelagius went farther than any who had preceded him; but he was by no means alone in asserting the natural goodness of man. The inference which he drew from this, in respect to the final state of the infant dead, he has expressed with so much caution that it does not become us to state it with too great assurance. It is clear, however, that he denies that infants are sinners in such a sense as to involve their condemnation; but he taught rather what was *not* the state of the infant dead than what it *was*. His language is: "*Quo non eant, scio, quo eant, NESCIO.*" It is not difficult to say what conclusion must follow his views of the moral purity of infants;—for if they are not sufficiently guilty to be lost, it follows by a very short inference that they will be saved—but such were the peculiarities of his mind and the circumstances of his condition, that his personal view might readily differ from the plainest consequences of his principles. And this appears to have been the case. His views of man's natural state would lead him in one direction, while those upon baptism inclined him to the other; and, as a middle course, according to Augustine, he held that infants dying unbaptized were not sent to hell, nor heaven, but admitted to a state of inferior bliss. But while these were the personal views of Pelagius, his principles plainly imply the salvation of all infants on the ground of their innocence.

Moreover, this sentiment underlies the whole system of Arminian theology, and is one of its chief corner-stones. With Arminius himself, it was a fundamental article of belief that no man will be condemned for original sin, and the very inference which he drew from it was, that all infants will be saved.

But the view now before us has found its fullest and latest exponents in the liberal theologians of New England. These sacred philosophers whose intellectual stature has towered above

the authority of the Bible, would have us think that sin is no terrible calamity after all; that kept free from the contamination of external evil, children will grow up in angelic freedom from sin, and, dying in this state of moral purity, are taken to Heaven solely on the merit of their own sinlessness.

We have no quarrel with the statement that all the infant dead are saved; on the contrary, we shall presently attempt to show that the Scriptures fully warrant such a belief. But to predicate the salvation of infants upon their *innocence*, is to announce a sentiment contradicted by the facts of daily experience and by the clearest light of inspiration. It is a fact too notorious to be questioned, that infants, at the most tender age, are subject to death; and, if "death entered the world by sin, and passed upon all men, because all have sinned;" then have we most unmistakable proof, appealing to our senses, and touching our hearts, that all are sinners. David confessed that he was shapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin, and every man, blessed with the Spirit which rested upon him when he made this confession, will acknowledge it as his own. That truth which lies at the very foundation of the Gospel, and is taken for granted in every part of it, is the *universal* depravity of our race. Without respect to age, or class, or condition, without a word of cautionary limitation, or explanatory comment, the Scriptures affirm that all men "are by nature the children of wrath;" that "there is *none* righteous, no, *not one*." The consequences of transgression involved the whole race of men, and extended through all generations from Eden to the Judgment-Seat. The virus of sin taints the blood of every descendant of Adam, so that the entire family of man, without a solitary exception, come into the world the natural and necessary heirs of a ruined patrimony. "There is *none* that doeth good, no, *not one*." It is therefore impossible, absolutely impossible, for any to enter heaven by their sinlessness. The gates of innocence are barred, and the only way whereby a soul may rest with God has been opened by the atoning death of Christ.

A *third* opinion respecting the state of the infant dead is, that *they have no existence beyond the present life*, but are

annihilated from the moment of dissolution. This sentiment appears first to have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding the monstrous conclusion that tender children are consigned to an eternal hell, because they have not been baptized; but their endless torture is scarcely more shocking than the thought of their annihilation. To assert this is to deny the immortality of the soul, or to affirm that infants are destitute of an immortal nature; and either hypothesis is abhorrent to both reason and Scripture. This theory is too monstrous ever to become general, and is almost unworthy of a serious discussion. It is flatly contradicted by every department of truth, and involves the character of God and the plainest intimations of his revelation in a maze of inexplicable mystery. Even dead matter experiences no annihilation; but through all the changes of which it is capable, carries an essence of being, which no power short of infinite can destroy. And shall the living soul, though cramped within the narrow prison of an infant's body, be extinguished forever by its fall? The argument which establishes the existence of an immortal soul in man, will prove the same true of an infant; the Scripture which reveals the one declares the other; and the evidence which would sweep away the future state of the youngest of our race, would cause the eternal world to vanish like the baseless fabric of a vision. Admitting that in the feeblest frame, there resides a soul stamped with the grandeur of an immortal destiny, the very absurdity of its extinction is its sufficient denial.

A *fourth* view entertained upon this question, is, that *the infants of believers, dying before they have committed actual sin, are saved, while all others are lost.* This belief was generally adopted by the Reformers, and widely maintained among Protestants for a long time. This was especially true of the Calvinists; and even the Arminians, without giving due weight to their views of original sin, seem to have taught that only the infants of believers are saved. In a quaint little book published anonymously in England, in 1658, there is a concise statement of the Arminian creed upon this point. The author's name was doubtless concealed on account of the



supremacy of the Presbyterians, but it is now known that the writer was Bp. Nomack, who died Bp. of St. David's in 1685. Baxter has said of him that he was the ablest man his party had in all the land, and Baxter certainly had opportunity to know him well, and was by no means prejudiced in his favor. This distinguished prelate has given the sentiments of his party in the following words :

"The Arminians believe:

*First*—That all the children of the *faithful* are sanctified in Christ: so that none of them, departing this life before they come to the use of reason, can perish.

They deny:

*First*—That some infants of the faithful are to be accounted in the number of the reprobates.

*Second*—They utterly deny, that some infants of the faithful, departing this life in their infancy, before they have committed any actual sin in their own persons, are reprobated.

*Third*—They do utterly deny, that the sacred laver of baptism, and the prayers of the Church, can no ways avail such infants."

No man, in his time, was able to speak more intelligently on this subject than the author of these propositions, and you will observe that he speaks only of the infants of the *faithful*. The Calvinists expressed themselves still more strongly, and nearly all the Protestant writers agreed that the infant dead of *only* believers were saved. Some associated this belief with the doctrine of election, and allowed their creeds to be modified by it. Others, with Zwingle and Perkins, founded it upon the Abrahamic Covenant, and therefore required the seal of baptism. But by far the greater number rested their opinion upon I. Cor. vii: 14: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."\* From this it was argued that being holy, the

---

\* It is worthy of note that this passage is the only proof-text which Neander finds for infant baptism. He confesses that it was not practised by the apostles, but thinks there is a germ here, from which it was early developed. We shall see whether the germ appears.

infants of believers are saved. We have only time, at present, to point out some of the difficulties which such an interpretation involves, and to indicate the real significance of the passage.

It will be apparent, at a glance, that the key to its proper interpretation lies in the word here rendered "holy," and applied to children. If, in consistency with the general scope of the passage and the immediate context, children, through the faith of either of their parents, are made holy in the sense of sinless, the inference that they will therefore be saved is just and unavoidable. Now, in respect to the sense in which this word is used, it is clear that it is employed in the same sense as sanctify; for the word rendered "holy" (*ἁγιά*, or in the verbal form, *ἁγιαζω*), and applied to children, has the same root as that rendered "sanctifieth," and applied to the unbelieving wife and the unbelieving husband. This passage, therefore, declares that *the same effect which the faith of one parent produces in the children, is also produced in the other parent remaining in unbelief*. And if the faith of a mother avails for the salvation of her children who die in infancy, then it must also avail for the salvation of her unbelieving husband dying in mature manhood. This passage affirms the same thing of both, and, in accordance with a fundamental law of interpretation, we must either claim the monstrous absurdity that the piety of a wife is a passport to Heaven for her ungodly husband, or we must confess that the faith of a parent has no saving efficacy for infant children.

The truth is, Paul wrote this passage without the slightest reference to the final state of infants. As the context abundantly proves, he is treating the subject of marriage, and meeting a popular error which had arisen in the Church at Corinth. In many instances those who had embraced Christianity were the heads of families, and it frequently came to pass, that while one parent believed the Gospel, the other rejected or neglected it. Probably, from an attempt to graft Judaism upon Christianity, some taught that a Christian wife ought not to live with an unbelieving husband, nor a Christian husband with an unbelieving wife. Paul said, no, you

might as well forsake your children who are not Christians; they are sacred to you; so the unbelieving husband is sanctified to his wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified to her husband. The primary meaning of the word here rendered "holy" and "sanctifying" is set apart, and sacredly devoted, and in this sense it is employed in the passage before us — Husband and Wife had been sacredly appointed one to the other in marriage, and Christianity neither sanctioned nor permitted any infraction of the vows then plighted. Paul here teaches that one sacred obligation is not annulled by another. Though a husband or a wife remained an unbeliever, they were still sacred; their children were still sacred. Duty to Christ interdicts no lawful relation, and since it was confessedly wrong for parents to abandon their children, it was equally so for husband or wife to separate from those to whom they had been sacredly united in marriage, on the pretext of religious duty. This, we think, is the teaching of this passage, and in the whole connection there is not the faintest intimation that Paul intended a word upon the question of infant salvation.

But, aside from these considerations, all truth is harmonious, and to affirm that any are saved through the piety of their ancestry, is not so much to misunderstand as it is to contradict the Scriptures. The Evangelist declares that salvation is "*NOT BY BLOOD, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*"

But if none are saved by the faith of their parents, neither are any *lost by the unbelief of their parents*. It is true, indeed, that the Scriptures speak of "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation;" but perhaps this language refers not so much to parents and their descendants, as to rulers and their subjects. In the patriarchal age the family and the state were closely united, and the relation of father and child was uniformly blended with the duties of king and subject. The kings were fathers, and the fathers were kings. The children were subjects, and the subjects children. It, therefore, came very naturally to pass that the words, fathers and children, which



to us express only domestic relations, in the time of Moses designated with equal clearness those of king and subject. And the frequency with which these words are employed in this sense by the writers of the Old Testament encourage the belief that they are so used in the first commandment. But, even though we adopt a more literal interpretation, we are compelled, by the teaching of other parts of the Bible, to limit its application to the present state of being. The apostle has laid it down, as the principle of the Final Judgment, "*Every one shall give an account of HIMSELF to God,*" and stand or fall "*according to that he hath done.*" And in the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel we read: "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the *soul that sinneth, it shall die.* Yet ye say, why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The *soul that sinneth, it shall die.* The *soul shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son;* the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

To those who acknowledge the authority of the Bible, these passages must set at rest all controversy. They teach, very clearly, that one soul will not be saved by the piety of another; nor will one perish on account of the sins of another. "The *soul that sinneth, it shall die.*"

A *fifth* opinion respecting the state of those who die in *infancy*, has been pointed out in the controversies of the Arminian and Calvinistic schools of theology. A favorite charge which Arminians have brought against their opponents is, that they have directly taught, or at least logically implied, the "monstrous doctrine of the damnation of infants." On the other hand, Calvinists have strenuously denied that they

hold such sentiments, either as an expressed article of their creed, or as a necessary deduction from it. About thirty-five years ago, a violent debate upon this subject was carried on by Prof. Norton of Cambridge, and Dr. Lyman Beecher.\* In a note appended to a republished sermon, Dr. Beecher denied that Calvinists "believe and teach that infants are damned, and that hell is doubtless paved with their bones." He declared that "he had never seen a book which contained such a sentiment, nor a man who believed or taught it." Prof. Norton replied that this "monstrous doctrine" might be found in standard Calvinistic writings, and was a necessary part of the Calvinistic system.

Neither our limits nor our inclination would lead us into a full review of this "sharp contention;" but it belongs to the historic part of our subject, and must not be passed over in silence.

After considerable care and study, it appears to us that Prof. Norton was right, in so far as he claimed that eminent Calvinists have taught that some infants are damned; and that he was wrong, in so far as he made this obnoxious sentiment a part of the Calvinistic system. We are not prepared to say whether or not any of the writings of Calvin teach the damnation of infants; but the faith of the Belgic Churches, upon this point, is thus expressed by an eminent professor in the University of Leyden: "All infants who are of the covenant and of *election* are saved." The Westminster Confession of faith speaks only of the salvation of "*elect* infants." And there is good reason to believe that many extreme Calvinists have held that some who die in infancy are elected and saved, and others are reprobated and lost.

But the real question to be determined is, *Does a belief in the doctrine of election logically imply the damnation of any who die in infancy?* To this inquiry we can find no other than a negative answer. If, in his absolute sovereignty, God

---

\*This discussion was published at length, in the *Christian Examiner*, for 1827 and 1828, and in the *Spirit of the Pilgrim* for 1828.

hath chosen his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, why must it follow that some of the early dead are excluded from that number? Why may not all such be excluded? The very idea of predestination implies, on God's part, unlimited freedom of choice; and if He hath elected whom He will, why may He not have chosen *all* who die before the age of accountability? We shall presently show from the Scriptures that this is precisely what He has done. But, for the present, if this be granted as a *possibility*, then may the sovereignty of God, with all its consequences, be held in perfect consistency with the salvation of all the infant dead.

Moreover, so far from contradicting this consoling belief, the doctrine of election furnishes the only rational ground upon which it can possibly rest. If infants are saved at all, it is solely because God hath determined to save them. They can do nothing for their own salvation, for they are incapable of moral action. Their parents cannot save them, for we have before seen that their spiritual state is in no wise affected by the moral relations of others. They are not saved because they are innocent, for the Scriptures reckon "*all under sin.*" Their eternal destiny is entirely dependent upon the will of God. If he has determined to save them, they will be saved, and otherwise they will be lost. The only basis of a belief in their final blessedness, is, that God hath *ordained* that the righteousness of Christ, without personal faith, shall avail in their behalf. This can never occur *contrary* to the determination of God, it can never *happen* as a fortuitous accident; it must, therefore, be accomplished by the sovereign will of Jehovah, or not at all. So far, then, from the doctrine of election furnishing any valid *objection* to a belief in the salvation of infants, it is the only ground upon which such a belief can rest.

We have thus given as extended a notice as our limits would permit, of the leading opinions upon the doctrine of infant salvation. We have seen, that those dying in infancy *are not saved by baptism, nor condemned for the want of it; that they are not saved because they are innocent; that they are not annihilated; that they are not justified by the faith,*



*nor condemned for the sins, of their parents; and that the sovereignty of God has sent out against them no decree of final reprobation.* What then is their condition for eternity? What answer shall we give to the tearful inquiries of wounded affection? What response from the faithful and true Witness comes to the unnumbered Rachels, weeping for their children because they are not?

For the answer to these questions, we appeal :—

## II. TO THE SURE WORD OF INSPIRATION.

But, before entering upon the Scriptural argument for the salvation of all who die in infancy, it must be noted, as a preliminary observation, that the Bible is addressed to the reason and consciences of men, and necessarily presupposes such a degree of maturity as involves moral responsibility. Upon all points bearing upon the destiny of accountable agents, there is the clearness and directness of a positive revelation; and such an amount of light as renders hesitation inexcusable and guilty. In questions respecting the final destiny of infants, however, the case is widely different. The future of the early dead can in no wise be affected by the facts of Revelation. It is not addressed to them, and upon them its truths have no direct bearing. All allusions to them, from the very nature and design of Revelation, are merely incidental, and only to such an extent as is demanded by the consistency of truth. It is, therefore, unreasonable to expect that the Scriptures should speak, upon the doctrine of Infant Salvation, with that distinctness and fulness which characterize their teachings upon other subjects. The light of Inspiration which pierces the gloom of an infant's grave, is but the splintered rays of its fulness, and the truth which it reveals with a good degree of certainty, is yet wanting in the clearness of its outline, and measurably enveloped in mist.

Keeping in mind this cautionary fact, let us consider some of those truths which have an incidental bearing upon the question under review.

And, *first: the only sin to which the New Testament Scriptures affix the penalty of eternal perdition, is one of which infants are not capable.* Of course it is not denied that

infants are sinners, or that any degree of *unpardoned* sin is sufficient to ruin the soul. But since the means of pardon have been provided by the death of Christ, the solitary cause assigned by the Bible for the perdition of any is, *unbelieving rejection of the Gospel*. "*This is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil.*" "*He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*" And such is the whole tenor of the New Testament. Believe and live; reject and be lost; this is the alternative which constitutes the whole burthen of the Gospel message. Now it is manifest that infants are morally incapable of rejecting the gospel, and are, therefore, not involved in that condemnation which is affixed to this sin alone.

But, perhaps it is objected that faith is the only condition of salvation, and if infants are incapable of *rejecting* the gospel, so also are they incapable of *accepting* it. To this we answer, that faith is *not* the only nor *principal* condition of salvation. It was first and most of all needful that Christ should make atonement, in order that man might be saved; and, indispensable as is faith to those who are capable of exercising it, it is not to be supposed that it is essential to the salvation of those who die before the years of accountability. Though infants are totally incapable of receiving the gospel as accountable man receives it, it does not therefore follow that they are altogether excluded from the benefits of Christ's sacrificial death. God requires of his creatures, "according to that they have, and not according to that they have not;" and our Lord plainly implies that any other principle would be manifestly unjust. Under His moral government, it cannot be that *all* the conditions of salvation which are demanded of responsible agents are required of unconscious babes. The first and principal condition of human recovery from the fall has been met in Christ, and inasmuch as faith is impossible to infants, it is fair to suppose that it is not required of them; and the fact that they are unable to commit that actual sin upon which condemnation is predicated, if it does not establish their salva-

tion, goes very far in encouraging such a belief. Our argument is, that, however it might have been if no acceptable ransom had been provided, since this unspeakable deed of love, irresponsible babes do not and cannot, as such, bring themselves under condemnation.

Moreover, *the resurrection of the bodies of infants affords a strong presumption of the salvation of their souls.* It is the explicit declaration of Scripture that "*all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth.*" In the sublime and troubled tragedies of the Apocalypse, John "saw the dead, *small* and great, standing before God." From these and similar passages it is abundantly evident that the resurrection trumpet shall break the slumbers of uncomputed millions, who fell into the grave in the fresh morning of their life. Now what is the object of the resurrection of this mighty host of the infant dead? Surely not that they may be judged, for judgment proceeds upon the supposition of responsible action, and of this infants are incapable. The Bible teaches us that the awards of the great assize will be distributed according to the deeds done in the body, but in the case of those we are now considering, there have been no moral deeds. Infants are not raised to be consigned to endless punishment, for we have before seen that they can never commit the sin against which this nameless curse has been denounced. There is, therefore, strong reason to believe that they are raised to spend an eternity in God's "presence where there is fulness of joy, and at his right hand where there are pleasures for evermore."

We have now seen that the salvation of all who die in infancy is rendered probable — *first*, by their inability to commit actual sin against which perdition is denounced, and *second*, by their resurrection. To render this probability a certainty, nothing now is needed more than to meet the charge that they perish because of original sin. If the early dead are lost, it is not because of actual transgression; for the very thing taken for granted throughout this article is, that they die before the dawn of moral responsibility. If they finally perish, it must, therefore, be because of their guilty nature.



But our *third* argument is based upon the fact that *the Scriptures teach that the guilt entailed upon the race by the first Adam, for those who die in infancy, was removed by the atoning death of the Second.* In the fifth chapter of his "Letter to the Romans," Paul announces two truths which have a direct and important bearing upon this point. *First*, we are assured that before the law—"from Adam to Moses"—"death reigned over those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Now of whom does the apostle hold this language? Not the heathen, for, like Adam, they have been guilty of actual transgression. Not Christians, for, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Of all the generations of men, there is but one class who have broken no known requirement, and therefore have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, and that is infants. That in all past time death has reigned over these, is a fact too notorious to need proof.

The *second* truth here stated by the apostle is, that "if through the offence of one many be dead, *much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.*"

These two truths are connected by the statement that Adam was a type of Christ; and the whole parenthesis, extending from the thirteenth to the eighteenth verse, applies to those who "have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," and affirms that the blessings of the atonement are exactly commensurate with the evils of Adam's sin.

Now, putting these truths together, the whole passage teaches that, just as the penalty of the first sin passes upon infants, destitute of actual transgression, much more—not as actors, but as subjects—are they partakers of the grace of God, and the gift by grace. By no effort of their own they became the heirs of death; and by an act of sovereign clemency they are made the heirs of life. Christ's righteousness, like Adam's sin, is transmitted to irresponsible babes, entirely irrespective of personal moral action. The turpitude of the first transgression, for all the early dead, is taken away by the merits of the only Saviour. Irrespective of personal

demerit, the first Adam brought sin and death upon every new-born infant; irrespective of personal merit, the second Adam shields those hapless babes with his own glorious righteousness. Dying in infancy, they die because Adam sinned; living in eternity, they live because Christ hath died. For them, whatever original sin may be—whether a leprous taint in the very nature, or only a bias to evil—it is cleansed away by the blood of Christ. Since Jesus hath died, it is nowhere intimated in the Scriptures that original sin *alone* will occasion the ruin of the soul; while, on the other hand, the passage we have just considered teaches, as we believe, that the effect of Adam's sin, for all who are free from personal transgression, is taken away by Christ. How, then, can the early dead be lost? They sink, not into the tomb of Adam, dark and silent, but into the new tomb of Jesus, radiant with hope, and vocal with the song of triumph. They enter heaven, not on account of the piety of their ancestry, not through the cleansing power of any outward rite, not because they are innocent; but they crowd the mansions of the blessed, and rain their crowns of life at Jesus' feet to sing, "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever."

To the correctness of this view the contrasted emotions of David at the death of Absalom and that of the child of Uriah's wife, furnish a strong proof. When his adult son sank as the victim of his own wicked folly, the grief of David was inconsolable. The great deep of his nature was broken up, and, in the bitterness of his soul, he cried, "O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" But when his infant child was taken away, he "arose from the earth and washed, and anointed himself, and changed his apparel, and came into the house of the Lord, and worshipped. Then he came to his own house, and when he required, they set bread before him, and he did eat." What is the secret of the bold and striking contrast in his conduct on these two occasions? David has furnished the answer: "While the

child was yet alive, I fasted and wept ; for I said, Who can tell whether God will be gracious to me, that the child may live ? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast ? Can I bring him back again ? *I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.*" Surely David could not have believed that his child was eternally lost ; for what consolation was there in the expectation of a similar doom soon to rest upon himself ? He could not have meant, as some would have us think, ' he is gone to the grave, and I shall soon follow him ; ' for how, then, with a tranquil heart and a cheerful countenance, could he have gone to the house of the Lord and worshipped ? No : David's deep and full-souled comfort arose from the conviction that his child was safe ; and that when his own immortal, soaring spirit should leap from its earthly tenement, he would meet and spend an eternity with that child, beyond the reach of grief and death. Of the abandoned Absalom he could cherish no such hope. He had gone down to the grave with actual and unrepented guilt. While, therefore, he could regard the death of his infant child with composure, that of his adult and wicked son filled his soul with unspeakable grief and alarm.

And it is especially worthy of notice, that the very case in which David expressed so strong a belief in the safety of a departed infant soul, was one in which, if ever, the iniquities of a parent would rest upon his child. Here was an infant whose very birth was connected with a series of base and revolting crimes ; and if God will ever visit hereafter the sins of a father upon his children, surely he would have done so with the child of Uriah's wife. Yet these sins of the father, great as they were, deeply as they were felt, clouded not his assurance of the *future* security of his babe. David's sins were visited upon his child *in this life*, but, speaking under the guidance of Inspiration, he affirmed his salvation *in the next*. The unerring Spirit of God gave to him the solacing assurance that he should meet his little one in heaven.

From these considerations we must believe that *all the infant dead are saved by the merits of Christ*. As before observed, the Scriptural allusions to this subject are purely



incidental; but even from these we are fully warranted in feeling and proffering the most substantial consolation to those who mourn the loss of their little ones.

---

#### ARTICLE VI.—VARIETY IN PULPIT INSTRUCTION.

---

[BY REV. WM. C. CHILD, BOSTON, MASS.]

---

It is not only important that the Gospel in its purity should be preached in our churches; but also that such exhibitions of it should be made, as will commend it to the intellects of men, enlarge their views of it, elicit their admiration of it, and induce them to embrace it. The consideration of this subject belongs particularly to ministers. If they are what they should be, every means that can be employed to extend the influence of religion in the world will be tried. The personal interest which they are supposed to feel in it will give them zeal in their labors, and the spirit of God will crown those labors with success.

If there be any class of men in the church with whom the triumphs of Christianity would naturally be an object of strong, nay, *intense* desire, it is the ministry. They are placed upon "the walls of Zion," and on account of the very prominence of their position, the success of the Gospel, or the want of it, is intimately and chiefly associated with them. Being the professed leaders of "the sacramental hosts," they naturally feel that if they do not lead those hosts on to contest and to victory, multitudes will, whether justly or otherwise, attribute the blame to them. Besides, if they are men of piety, as the judgment of charity constrains us to assume, it must be to them a matter of deep solicitude that the objects to

which they have consecrated their energies, and with which they have become in a special manner identified, should be most effectually accomplished.

The peculiar and primary sphere of the ministry is the pulpit. To fit them for that sphere has been the grand aim of their previous preparation, both of mind and of heart. It is there that they come more immediately in contact with the understandings and sensibilities of men. To them the Gospel has been committed as a trust. They are to proclaim it to the world. However much they may do so in their private walks as pastors, they are to remember that "the great commission" that has been given them is to preach the word publicly, and in its entire extent, both for the edification of saints, and for the conversion of sinners. There is a sense in which *every* Christian is commissioned to publish the story of the Cross with his lips, while he illustrates the power of that Cross by his life; but we are accustomed to regard the ministry as a *divinely appointed* office, and the men who fill it as called to the performance of peculiar duties—duties that come not within the province of any other class of individuals. In the present state of society, when Christian churches are permanently established, and one day in seven is, by common consent, observed as a day of religious services, on which multitudes repair to houses of worship for the purpose of receiving spiritual instruction, it is necessary that ministers of the Gospel should regard the duties of the Sabbath as the *great* duties to which they are called, and to which they should devote their chief attention. For it is manifest that if those duties are neglected, the interests of religion must suffer. The pulpit may be considered the forum of the church, where her cause is vindicated, and where her enemies are tried. Around it vast numbers gather, and on it innumerable eyes are fixed. Consequently it comes to occupy a lofty place in the respect and affection of those who are educated under its influence. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance that the power of the pulpit be preserved, and its demands be fully met. If its claims are unheeded, or are made to give way to others, it is verily causing the greater to yield to the less, allowing what

was designed to be the principal agency in advancing the cause of the Redeemer, to be laid aside, measurably at least, and substituting inferior ones in its place. So that in the warfare of the church against sin, the minister of the Gospel should feel that he is in his appointed position, and performing his more appropriate work, in the pulpit, just as the general is occupying his proper sphere, and fulfilling his more specific duty, when at the head of his army, and leading his soldiers against the foe. This is the place he is called to fill. Stationed there, and in Christ's stead unfolding the messages of divine love, he is indeed a "legate of the skies."

Such being the more particular field of the minister's exertions, it must be to him an inquiry of no ordinary interest, how he can invest his efforts with the highest degree of attraction, and thus most effectually secure — so far as human means can secure it — the legitimate and designed end of preaching. The commission that has been given him informs him definitely as to *what* he shall preach, and he is not at liberty to deviate a hair's breadth from its instructions. To fail as to the *matter* of his communications would, in our estimation, be a forfeiture of that commission, if he had ever received one; for we must suppose it to be a gross absurdity, that a man who has embraced great and fundamental errors should have been authorized by the Head of the Church to proclaim them. But while the truth to be taught is what is revealed, it must, or should, be a matter of solicitude with the preacher, how he can best declare it. In what forms can he present his messages, so that they shall exert the most permanent influence on the minds and hearts of his hearers? What views can he take of truth that will render it most striking and most likely to arrest and fix attention? And since the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, or those which relate to the salvation of the soul, are few and simple, and constant familiarity with them is calculated to divest them of the charm and power of novelty, thus rendering those who are not at heart interested in religion comparatively insensible to its instructions and claims, how can the ministrations of the pulpit be made to afford a permanent pleasure, and thus increase



the probability of imparting real profit? We must suppose, other things being equal, that those minds which are most constantly kept contemplating truth, give the fairest promise of being ultimately brought to feel its saving energy. The preservation of a continuous interest in the Gospel hence assumes to the minister an aspect of no inferior importance.

We would not be unmindful of the fact, that it is "not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit" of God, that the Gospel is to work its way to the hearts of men; but since the human mind is constituted as it is, and truth must find a lodgment there before it can reach the soul, it must be a matter of some moment to ascertain how truth can be so adapted to the intellect as to meet the demands of the mind without creating a disrelish for it by familiarity with it. It is perhaps an evil incident to our present mental constitution and state, that we crave novelty. What is old, however valuable, does not seem to interest us long, unless it has enlisted our affections. Whatever we truly love is an unfailing source of pleasure; but what appeals to mere intellect, comes to be fatiguing to most persons, and ceases at last deeply to engage the attention. So, unless there is the charm of novelty thrown around the pulpit, its instructions are shorn of much of their power. Though the truths of religion are all-important, their reiteration, Sabbath after Sabbath, in the same manner, would fail to continue the excitement which their first enunciation created, even if they were proclaimed by angelic lips, and with the loftiest eloquence. It is surprising to see how the most stupendous of all concerns soon comes to be to the mind an object of indifference, while the most insignificant trifle, whose origin and end are compressed within the limits of a brief moment, may excite an interest amounting even to enthusiasm. It is true, this peculiarity of the mind is more strongly marked in some individuals than in others; but all partake of it. Never do we discover, in perverted humanity, such a perfection of mental and moral adjustment as causes *all* things, at *all* times, to assert and maintain their true relative importance. Hence can be seen a powerful reason why the exhibitions of truth

made from the pulpit should be as varied as possible, and why the preacher should

“Try each art, reprove each dull delay,  
Allure to brighter worlds, and lead the way.”

We may be met here by the declaration that, in apostolic times, those who preached the Gospel evidently confined themselves to the simple announcement of Christ crucified, — that the fundamental and saving truths of religion are few and obvious, — and that these constitute the staple of the commission given by our Lord to his disciples. But a moment's reflection will suffice to show us that the minister of the Gospel, in a Christian land, and pastor of a church, is situated very differently from the first propagators of Christianity. They lived in an age when this was a new system of religion, and they were called to expound its elementary principles. The rudiments of this sublimest of sciences were then to be taught. The true light had but just begun to shine in all its radiance; and falling first on their minds and hearts, the apostles hastened to reflect its beams on others. Their chief desire was, that the whole world might bask in its rays. Hence the simplest process by which this result could be secured was employed by them. They had many to enlighten, and a dense darkness to remove. Fixing their eyes on men as sinners, and as needing salvation, they made it their chief aim to proclaim the great remedy for sin, of which the world had not before heard, because it had but just been fully and clearly revealed. Or, in other words, they were, in an emphatic sense, reformers, and reformers always employ, in the execution of their mission, a few great fundamental principles, which, from their very simplicity and obviousness, more strongly impress the mind.

Besides, the ministry whose history is brought to view in the New Testament, was an itinerating ministry. They had no settled charges. Preaching from place to place, and gathering into churches the converts whom their preaching had made, they were compelled, from necessity, to reiterate the same great truths, in the same connections, and with the same

immediate ends. Hence it could be said of them, with marked significance, that among the people to whom they ministered, they literally knew nothing but "Christ and him crucified."

In the present age of the world, and in Christendom, the circumstances of the ministry are vastly dissimilar. Except in the case of missionaries, they address, and that too, frequently, those who have been familiar with the Gospel from childhood. Hence it is necessary for them to vary somewhat from that one course of thought which was the burden of primitive preaching. The very frequency with which they appear before the same people, obliges them to present, if not new truths, at least new forms or combinations of truth, so that their communications may be invested with some measure of novelty, or at all events the appearance of it. A community who *seldom* hear a sermon might be satisfied with a repetition of essentially the same propositions in the few discourses to which they might have the privilege of listening; for in such a case the very infrequency of the service would supply the requisite characteristic of novelty. This is undoubtedly true of many of the newer sections of our country. But where a congregation enjoy, uninterruptedly, the services of the Sabbath, an intellectual daintiness is engendered, which is ever clamorous for those viands which have the quality of novelty, as well as that of being highly palatable.

We are to bear in mind that wherever the Gospel is preached, new relations, in some respects, are created, inasmuch as they to whom it is addressed are placed, in consequence, in another position. They stand in a different attitude in reference to God, from that which they held before they became acquainted with the doctrines of religion. Previously they were constrained to contemplate him as a stern and inexorable Lawgiver; but now they see him in a new character, and learn that the whole course of their aims and duties is changed. A dispensation of law is a very different thing from one of grace, as it respects man, and consequently the motives, aims and actions peculiar to each are unlike. It is true, also, that a knowledge of the Gospel causes its possessor to assume a



new position in reference to his fellow-men. The presentation, in all its extent, of this broad subject, viz: *the relation in which the Gospel places man to his God and to the human family*, is the duty of the preacher, the work to which he has been called.

The two great dispensations that have characterized the religious history of the race, seem, to a superficial observer, to have been pervaded and distinguished by opposite moral principles. But this is not so. Love is at the foundation of each, even though Justice flames and thunders from Sinai, and Mercy sends forth cries of commiseration and entreaty from the summit of Calvary. The harmony, propriety, beauty and true relation of each of these systems to the other, are for the ambassador of Christ to elucidate.

It is an error into which some have fallen, either in consequence of failing to perceive the Gospel, and the new relations which it creates, in their true, practical connections, or because of the limited nature of their intellectual powers, that a few great and fundamental truths should constantly be kept most prominent. They endeavor literally to imitate the example of the primitive ministry, and hence of necessity become mere exhorters. They seem to think that all that appertains to religion consists in one idea, and that is the Cross. They forget that the Cross is a sun, illumining a vast surrounding space, and an immense area of human relationships. They seem unconscious of the fact, that it is duty to explore and examine what is thus illumined, as well as to gaze at the great dispenser of light. They are unmindful of the truth that the moral system which is thus made so resplendent, had the same origin with the glorious orb that makes it so, and illustrates the same wisdom, power, and love that shine forth from it. They do not see that a clear understanding of the objects brought into notice by the light, is as necessary to an enlarged, comprehensive view, as an acquaintance with the luminary. Now, as in nature there is a time to turn geographers, and study the face of the globe on which we dwell, and another time to turn geologists, and plunge below the surface, and become acquainted, so far as may be, with the earth's crust,

and another time still, when the sun is absent, to turn astronomers, and survey the vast firmament with its myriads of flaming orbs; so in divine things, the minister is called upon to take a corresponding range of thought and investigation. The Cross is sufficiently his theme, if its true relations are thus exhibited, and repentance and faith, the rudimental truths and duties of religion, are distinctly recognized and really enforced, if man's character and position in God's spiritual system are clearly defined. Indeed, these duties cannot have a rational basis unless this be done. There are, and there ever must be, in the moral universe, heights to which a finite mind, in its present state at least, cannot soar; and depths so profound that it cannot fathom them, and an extent too broad for its comprehension; but this fact should not prevent an *attempt* to soar as high as possible, to descend as deep as the ability of the mind will allow, and to take as wide a range as its nature will permit. As it would betray a narrow intellect, to make the sun in our solar system the *sole* object of contemplation and study, excluding every other portion of the Creator's vast dominions from the view; so in the science of religion, that professed instructor is far from performing his whole duty, who ceaselessly keeps his eye on the Cross and on that alone. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. The minister should ever live at the foot of the Cross; on him its light should shine with undimmed splendor, and from that spot he should go forth in his excursions of thought, carrying with him the light which has been shed upon his own soul, and reflecting it upon all his pathway; thus superadding it to that which had gone out before him in the same direction, and rendering his track more luminous.

Those to whose error on this subject allusion has been made, seem to forget that the minister of Christ is an instructor as well as an exhorter, and appear unable to see how a doctrine which does not expressly include repentance and faith, the first principles of religion, can be related to practical Christianity. They assume that the conversion of souls is the great object for which they should labor, and that what does not immediately bear upon this end, does not come within the

province of their duty. To them this is the "all and in all" of religion. And their ill success, in permanently interesting the same people, shows the mistake which they have made. Exhausting, in a short time, their stock of topics, and ranging perpetually in the same circle—and that a small one—they soon fail to interest their hearers. This is the necessary and inevitable consequence. It is not in the nature of things that it should be otherwise. But, on the contrary, let the minister constantly present new and attractive combinations of truth, and show how harmonious, symmetrical, and mutually dependent are the different parts of the divine system, constituting an unity, the central point of which is the Cross of Christ, and he will never fail to interest and instruct. His power over his hearers will continually increase. They will acquire a growing respect for him, on account of his intellectual ability, and their confidence in the truth which he preaches will strengthen. The very fact that that truth is capable of putting on forms ever new, and of being presented in relations ever varying and comprehensive, will secure for it, among intelligent men, a candid attention. And as their views become thereby enlarged, the work which the preacher has to do, so far as the intellect is concerned, will advance towards a happy termination.

In religion, as elsewhere, the understanding is most intimately associated with the heart. The understanding must first be convinced. Where this is effectually done, there is a far greater prospect of the Gospel's accomplishing its appropriate and designed work. If the outposts of the intellect are carried, the citadel of the heart is more likely to surrender before the assaults of the truth. But if the understanding remain unconvinced, and there is nothing in the preaching listened to to convince it, the prospects of success are necessarily small.

Our course of remark has already brought before us the importance of variety, or an abundance of instruction given from the pulpit, as distinguished from sameness in regard to matter and manner, or the perpetual recurrence of the same thoughts in the same connections,—that variety which may



be furnished, year after year, by a preacher whose mind is profound and inventive, whose observation is minute and extensive, and whose soul holds converse with Heaven,—that variety which gives an incessant novelty and freshness to the addresses of some men, even when the truths which they utter have been long familiar to their hearers. This desideratum can be reached, and it remains for us to consider how.

It is the work of the minister, not only to fit men for Heaven; but to make them what they should be, in every respect, on earth. To accomplish this object, the only instrument which he has to employ is truth. Truth must be poured into the intellect as a receptacle, so that it may be diffused thence, by an attendant divine process, through the heart, communicating moral life, purifying the motives, and prompting to such an activity as resembles the example set by the Redeemer of man.

As truth is the great instrument which the preacher employs, it may not be amiss to consider the question: "What is truth?" Our answer is: *Truth is that which is real — that which has a positive existence.* There can be no reality in that which is *not* truth. All that is *not* truth is error, and error has only an *imaginary* existence, is fiction. It is, or may be, a combination of the *elements* of truth into *unreal* forms — forms which are found nowhere else than in the imagination. Error may spring from, or employ universally recognized principles; but applies them as they are not applied in reality or fact. The *premises* may be correct; but the process of reasoning is not legitimate, and the conclusion, consequently, is fallacious. The systems of error that exist may, in this view, be said to be not wholly destitute of a seeming basis, and it may even be affirmed that some of the *materials* of those systems may be good; but the superstructure erected with those materials is such as will easily be demolished; nay, such as demands the incessant propping of a human arm, because it is not built on a firm foundation, is not jointed and fitted in all its parts, and has not such an adjustment and proportion as consolidate it into a well compacted, symmetrical and beautiful unity.

Truth, then, is only another term for reality. It includes

whatever exists in the universe. It embraces all beings, all worlds, all relations, and all actions. God is the great centre with which it is connected. Truth being only another term for the real universe, it may be affirmed that, as that universe came from him as a great originating source, so truth came from him, clusters around him, and is dependent on him. But so far as truth includes sin or evil, as a fact, its dependence on God must be regarded as indirect and not necessary, inasmuch as another agency, although an agency which he created, was more properly the author of sin.

Thus truth sustains a relation to God, and to every other reality. As every particle of matter in the globe has a connection of attraction with every other particle of matter, with the sun, planets, stars, and indeed with the whole material universe, so there is a connection, even though it may be of the slightest kind, between every real event or fact, as such, in existence. Hence the universe is full of relations, and they are as numerous as the combinations that can be made. Every truth is itself a centre, with cords of relation binding it to every other, but having its strongest connection with God, as the great centre of all. So that when the contemplating mind applies itself to the universe of truth, it sees, if its vision be correct, the existing connections and harmonies. It discovers innumerable lines, running from object to object, and from fact to fact, and along these lines it follows with the rapidity of its own quick-moving thoughts. While it distinctly observes true and real relations, it is safe; but when these are lost sight of, and fanciful ones are substituted in their place, it is involved in the perplexities of error.

Every true relation perceived, is a distinct object of cognition. As the mind takes two or more facts, and traces their relation to each other, it has before it one or more intellectual perceptions, which, if expressed in words, might be denominated statements, or propositions. These constitute a small portion of the system of truth, as including created objects and resultant facts. And regarding the system of truth as a unity, composed of parts, any statement or proposition spoken of must be sustained by the rest. And all the remainder is

one great, standing argument for it, because together they make one harmonious whole.

In illustration of this view, and for the purpose of showing, though in a comparatively abstract manner, the almost interminable extent of the relations of truth, and the amplitude of the field from which the preacher can draw variety in his ministrations, let us suppose a map to be spread out before us. In the centre of it is a point, which may be regarded as representing, in the Christian system, the Cross of Christ, with lines proceeding from it, in every direction, to innumerable other points, at every variety of distance from that centre. And suppose that there are lines drawn from each point to every other, so that each one may be connected with all the rest, as the central one is. We should have a multitude of lines of relation, and could trace them in ten thousand different directions, while they would still remain in the same system, as a distinct unity. So the preacher, with his home in the very shadow of the Cross, and ever going forth from it in the excursions which he makes in the realms of truth, can find paths to travel in, as numerous and as varied as the relations sustained between an infinite God and the unnumbered beings and facts of the universe. And indeed, with so many courses marked out before him, it would seem both difficult and unnatural for him ever to tread in the same path, even though it might be the divinely illumined one, trodden for so many ages, around the Cross itself.

Or, we can compare the universe of truth to an immense superstructure, complete and symmetrical, in which every component part sustains a relation to the whole and to every other part. And as, in this superstructure, every part strengthens every other, so in the great system of truth, every relation sustains every other, and is, in some sense, an argument for every other. No finite mind — no mind but that of the Omniscient One — can comprehend at once *all* truth, and hence no finite mind is able to perceive the more or less intimate relation that exists between all the different single truths in the universe, and their bearing upon each other; but it can see the connection between those which come under its eye.



and the centre, or that which exists between two or more that are both or all perceived by it. He who stands upon any spot on the earth's surface can, at times at least, see the sun and those objects which immediately surround him; but he cannot observe what is found on the opposite side of the globe. So in the intellectual world, we can always keep in view God, as the great central truth, and can always behold the relation between the facts that come under our immediate inspection, and Him their great source and centre.

We have taken this view to indicate how vast an amount of material the preacher has to draw from, and what an almost illimitable scope there is for the exercise of the powers of his mind in the work of communicating religious instruction. The field of truth being so extensive, the inquiry may suggest itself, whether the whole of it is to be explored by the minister of Christ? We answer, No. The longest life and the mightiest abilities would be insufficient for this, even if it were an object of desire. Besides, innumerable facts and relations exist with which the religious teacher has nothing to do. He is to confine himself to those things which have a direct connection with God and man, and which have a bearing upon man's moral state. This would lead him to make a distinction as to the class of topics which he would introduce into the pulpit. *All* the relations which man sustains are not to be considered, for he has many that only slightly and indirectly have reference to his moral character. He is associated with whatever is embraced in a universal philosophy; but the philosophy of the pulpit has its distinct and peculiar sphere—a sphere which necessarily has its limitations likewise.

It is the practice of some religious teachers to take into the pulpit discussions on scientific subjects, and they endeavor to make such discussions have a moral or religious bearing. Such things, we rejoice to believe, are not extensively done by evangelical ministers; but there are so-called religious teachers, with whom the practice is very common. Every new discovery made, and its application to the social condition of the race, comes under their review. Questions of a political nature are freely canvassed. The purest and most

unprofitable speculation is freely indulged in. It is true, perhaps, that an attempt may be made to give these topics a moral or religious direction. But this manifestly cannot be done with any success, for such themes are unsuited to the dignity of a religious service. And, moreover, while there is a vast superabundance of truth (if we may so speak) intimately related to the soul and its highest interests—an amount which, in the comprehensive and divinely taught mind, is perfectly inexhaustible—there is no need of introducing any other class of topics. We would say, also, that if those topics which are foreign to man's spiritual nature, are introduced, they cannot do otherwise than divert the mind from its gravest concerns, and impair its estimate of the importance of religion. We think it will be found to be true, likewise, that where the pulpit is made the place for the discussion of mere scientific and ethical principles, a mode of entertainment adopted to while away a tedious hour, or to satisfy the demands, and quiet the voice, of conscience, a sense of immortality and of accountableness, and of the love of God, is feeble in the extreme. Under such ministrations, the worldly find influences that tend to lull them to repose while in the ways of sin. The idea of holiness of heart and character, of living for the glory of God, and of securing eternal felicity to the undying powers of thought and of feeling in man's nature, becomes extinct under such a religious training. The great ends of existence are lost sight of. Now, every mind is conscious of the fact, that all the appliances that can be employed are needed to quicken and deepen in the human soul a sense of a coming existence and of a solemn responsibility. The services of the sanctuary cannot be too highly impregnated with purely spiritual elements, nor can the impressions which they should make upon the mind be too strong and subduing. Too stern and elevated views of life cannot be given, nor can the connection between action and character in the present world, and destiny in the world to come, be represented in too glowing colors. And in the nature of things it is impossible that such results should be secured by disquisitions on subjects which have but a remote connection, if any at all, with man's eternal state beyond the grave.

Christ gave his apostles a commission to preach the Gospel. That Gospel was designed more particularly for man's higher and religious nature. And in fulfilling this commission, Christ's ambassadors should address themselves to that part of man's nature for which the Gospel was designed, and to which it is adapted. They should discuss only such topics as are included in, or are inseparably connected with, the Gospel. Science is important in its place, and the ten thousand facts that exist, and events that occur in the progress of time and of society, can be regarded as possessing, in some sense, a religious character, inasmuch as they come from God ; but Christ never commissioned his disciples to proclaim any other science than religion, as contained or implied in the Gospel, or to make the theme of their discourses any event which is not intimately associated with the moral character and well-being of man.

The preacher finds the nature of those whom he addresses complex. Man is not all intellect, nor all feeling, nor all action ; but intellect, feeling, and action are combined in his constitution. He needs aliment for his mind to feed on, and an intellectual basis on which his faith can rest. There is, likewise, a necessity for something to arouse and excite his emotional nature. So, also, an impulse is needed to prompt him to action.

Now faith, feeling, and action, are closely connected. They are the links of the chain that binds man's three-fold being into one—a trinity that comprises all that belongs to humanity. The preacher, if he understands his work, knows that belief must precede feeling, and that, consequently, truth must be presented with clearness to the mental eye, in order that it may be perceived as such. He cannot expect that the slumbers of the soul will be disturbed, and that the soul will be made to feel, unless something is believed. The connection between belief and feeling is so intimate that the work of the minister has a primary relation to the intellect, and that the most conspicuous exhibitions of the great doctrines of the Gospel should be addressed to it. It is such exhibitions of truth that are accompanied by the Holy Spirit's power, and secure the



great ends and aims of religion. Right affections of heart are begotten by their instrumentality, and by the same means the process of sanctification is carried on.

It is equally true, that unless there is the right feeling in the heart, there cannot be right action in the life. The way to produce action is to excite emotion. And the way to excite emotion is to present the truth in all its importance, simplicity, and power. Aside from the necessity for a super-human influence—which we strongly maintain—truth produces a great effect upon the feelings through the understanding; not sufficient, indeed, to change the heart, but sufficient to create oftentimes a temporary interest in religious concerns, and to arouse the mind to new thought. It is difficult—nay, impossible—for us to determine the relative power of truth, and that of the Holy Spirit, in the conversion of the soul. We know that they are united, and that the Spirit of God employs the truth as an instrument. And we have reason to believe, likewise, that there is a higher probability that this celestial Agent will accompany the truth when it is clearly and forcibly presented, than when it is obscured, or exhibited in intangible or indefinite forms. Instead of acting in violation of the laws of the mind, he acts in accordance with them. A right state of heart, as well as a right course of action, must, therefore, be closely connected with such a presentation of truth as will create a respect for the truth itself, and command the full assent of the understanding. An impression in favor of religion is made upon the mind only when religion is seen to be reasonable in its nature and claims. It must be shown to be in harmony with the demands made by the character of God and of man, and to have an argument for it in every known relation yet discovered in the intellectual universe.

Those truths that are brought before the mind, as the facts of Christianity or of religion, are doctrines. The fact of God's existence, and of his attributes, is a doctrine. The depravity of man, and the atonement, are doctrines. These doctrines, as facts, are all, too, most intimately connected with the great common centre, God. They can be considered in their relation to Him. And they furnish, as it regards man, the motives

that are to influence him to act. They are associated with him as well as with God. It is, indeed, in some sense, through them that his association with God exists. Take them away, and he is in a state of complete religious isolation, or passivity. Nothing is required of him, or expected from him, he feels the force of no claim, he experiences an impulse to no duty. He is enshrouded in a darkness so dense, that he sees not how, or whither he can go. Doctrines are luminous way-marks, that indicate to him the path that leads to life and happiness. They are voices that are ever speaking to him of duty, and contain, in their very announcement, the arguments they employ.

Now let the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity, in their true relations, be clearly and forcibly presented before the mind of a man. Explain them in their connection with himself. Show him how some of them came to have an existence in consequence of his peculiar character and state. Let these doctrines be surrounded with a flood of light, so that the joints by which they are united to each other can be distinctly seen, and their internal and external harmony unmistakably discovered, and something is done toward the great end of preaching. And what a field does this present! When it is necessary to concentrate the light to a focus (so to speak), so that doctrines can be contemplated in their individual, isolated character, their nature can be unfolded and exhibited to the gaze of the mind. At other times, the light may be scattered over the whole area which they cover, and thus bring to view the various relations which they sustain. Sometimes, borrowing an illustration from science, the microscope can be employed in order to discover what is minute, and thus likely to elude the sight; while in other circumstances the telescope can be brought into requisition, for the purpose of sweeping the whole firmament of truth. There are, in the system of religion, both generalities and specialties. On different occasions, and in different circumstances, each should be made prominent. They are all necessary, to a complete and intelligent view—such a view as is calculated to convince and satisfy the mind, as well as to move the heart.

The doctrines of religion appear, to the mental eye, new and different from every position occupied in viewing them. As the peculiar features of a beautiful landscape seem changed by observing it from various points, ever forming new combinations, and wearing new aspects, while the essential elements of it are always the same, so is it in regard to the doctrines of religion. If the preacher have the ability to place his mind in different attitudes, when dwelling upon them, he will see them in different relations, and having different bearings. New visions of beauty and harmony will be constantly opening before him, which, if communicated to others, will not fail to interest them. As the doctrines of religion are truth — the *highest* truth — and as they possess the peculiarity of being widely related, so they must furnish a perpetual novelty, if rightly viewed. They are like lofty mountains, which, seen from a larger distance, have vaster relations, and a greater variety of aspects than little hillocks, which are, by a walk of few moments' duration, lost from the sight. Being designed for the race, and being great and glorious enough for eternal contemplation, even a slight change of the standpoint from which they are surveyed must invest them with new beauties, new freshness, and new attractions.

The doctrines of religion are not to be considered as abstract truths; but as having a direct and specific application to human life. Man, to whom they are taught, is a religious being, and the preacher is to consider him as such in his relations and duties, both to his Creator and to his fellow-men, and likewise as possessing an unregenerate or renewed nature. As still uninterested in the Gospel, a thousand views of truth can be spread before him, such as are calculated to excite inquiry, to convince the judgment, and to touch the heart. Sometimes the more particular domain of the understanding can be entered, and at other times that of the conscience and the sensibilities. As a Christian, and meeting innumerable obstacles to the growth of his piety, the means of developing a complete, symmetrical, religious character can be presented to him by the minister of Christ. The vicissitudes of life, the ways of Providence, the great diversity among men as to



character and situation, and the ever varying phases of feeling in circumstances always changing — these and very many kindred themes can be made the topics and the occasions of spiritual improvement. As the nature of the Deity and man's great relations and duties are immutable, the subjects for instruction which they furnish are ever the same; but as the connection of humanity with a transitory world imposes upon man constant changes of relative position, the adaptation of religion to *all* his necessities, even temporary ones, can be made apparent by the preacher, while communicating the instruction and aid demanded by each emergency. And as many of these changes of feeling and condition are to be attributed to God's providence, this great and prolific theme can be considered, especially as bearing upon man's duty. What is true of man as an individual is true also of society as such. The history of one is essentially the history of multitudes. And where there is a great variety of circumstances or personal history, the opportunity for variety in the teachings of the pulpit is more favorable than it would be otherwise.

Whatever may be said to the contrary, we are satisfied that the feelings and actions of men, and consequently their real character in the sight of God, are most intimately associated with, if they do not spring from, the creed which they adopt. Their religious activities depend, as to form and degree, upon what they believe, and upon the strength of their faith. The Pagan, the Mohammedan, the Papist, and the true Christian, each pursues a course differing from the others, and the heart of each is subject to equally dissimilar emotions. It is hence evident that the preacher of the Gospel should, as we have seen, thoroughly instruct his hearers in the great truths of revelation, which are messages coming from God, and which they are bound to credit and receive. These truths, if their natural tendency were not arrested by the depravity of the human soul, would sustain to the religion of the heart and of the life the relation of cause to effect. A mind in a holy state — the state in which man was originally created — could not resist the force of truth, as an impelling

power. Its machinery would act in an orderly, regular, harmonious, and beautiful manner, and as a necessary consequence, would work out the designs of omniscience. But sin has deranged that machinery, and it cannot accomplish the end for which it was created. Still, it is necessary that the power continue to be applied, in the hope and with the expectation that the great Spiritual Machinist will, by the interposition of a divine influence, repair its derangement, and cause a return of perfect action. While Christianity, as a practical system, is eminently simple, and by changing the current of the affections, directs and controls the whole man, it is at the same time a vast and somewhat complicated scheme, and as a science furnishes an abundance of topics for contemplation. If complicated as a system, it is simple in its application. Its requirements can be easily understood by all; but the comprehension of the great scheme itself, even so far as it is revealed to mortals, is not the attainment of every intellect that is deemed to be well versed in religious truth. As close an approximation to this should be made as is possible, however, and should form the great aim of him to whom is committed so responsible a trust as watching for souls.

The facts or doctrines of truth, inasmuch as they should be the instruments employed in making men feel and act, are to be exhibited in such a way as to effect this object. In doing this, variety in pulpit instruction can be secured. Doctrinal statements, however clear, are not enough. They might be sufficient, if men were accustomed to reflect, and to trace out, in an honest manner, what should be the bearings of truth upon their characters and conduct. But most men are unwilling to do this. Many are incapable of it, from the existence of inveterate, unfavoring habits. Besides, when truth loses its theoretical forms, and assumes new and practical ones, it is met by an obstacle found in the depravity of the heart. When it acts upon the conscience, like a caustic, it burns, and produces pain by the contact. The generality of men who are brought up under the influence of the preaching of it, know this from experience, and hence shrink from inflicting torture upon themselves. And it is often the case, like

wise, that if the truth is allowed to bear upon the life and conduct, it is felt to be not only in conflict with inclination, but also with interest. These considerations show that the preacher should *apply*, as well as expound, the truth. He should not leave his hearers to perform this part of duty for themselves, for the very simple reason that, in such a case, it is likely to be altogether neglected. In the sphere of his peculiar labors he must do all the thinking himself, for fear that the principles and truths he develops may sink no deeper into the nature than the intellect, thus leaving the sensibilities unaffected, and never disclosing themselves in the practicalities of the life. This of course will give him a larger scope, and diminish the necessity for a charge of sameness in his preaching. It is his province to appeal to the interests — the real and highest interests — of those whom he addresses, to make direct assaults upon their consciences, to excite their hopes, and to arouse their fears. For all these descriptions of discourse, he has precedents and examples in the word of God, and they are strictly in accordance with those principles which we recognize as fundamental in human nature. In a word, all those methods of influencing men which can honorably be employed in other matters, can be adopted in endeavoring to attain the great ends for which the pulpit, or rather, preaching of the Gospel, was established.

It is by way of appeal that truth is most likely to affect the conscience and the sensibilities. It is thus that its moving power addresses itself most directly to the heart. It is in this way that the fires of logic warm and fuse the soul. In appeal, the most important of all considerations are brought into immediate contact with the living man, his understanding not only, but his will. And where, within the whole range of interests, do we find so important ones as those with which the preacher deals? Those concerns that were instrumental in giving to the world what are deemed the noblest specimens of eloquence the annals of the race can boast, were trifles in comparison. In the one case they were temporal, and pertained merely to the body, and the social state of man, while in the other they are eternal, and have reference to the



immortal nature and its eternal condition ! And those interests, capable of every kind of illustration, and admitting of every kind of appeal, in connection with them, ought of themselves to contribute much towards securing variety of discourse from him who is called, in the providence of God, to deal more particularly with them.

The Gospel, whose advocate the minister is, discovers a wonderful adaptation to every kind of feeling. It addresses itself to indifference slumbering on the couch of carnal pleasure, and with stentorian tones arouses it to sensibility. It is able, by its peculiar consolations, to dissipate the cloud of gloom that may have gathered over the mind. It has power to drive from the chambers of the soul the grim spectre of despair, and to light them up with the beams of hope and assurance. By the energy of the Gospel, distrust and unbelief can be made to fly from the spirit, like mists before the morning sun. Its province is to fill the soul with peace and joy, and in doing so, it removes from before it any obstacle that may place itself in the way. All its tendencies are upward towards felicity, and to that point its sweetly constraining forces, and its unequal attractions, labor to draw the mind. So that in this multifarious power of the Gospel can be seen resources that enable the minister to vary his ministrations to an almost infinite extent.

Connected with this part of pulpit instruction is the duty of analyzing feelings, resolving difficulties, and removing doubts. It can reasonably be expected of the ministry that they meet and remove the objections that rise up in candid, but not captious, minds. There are many such objections that occur in connection with revelation, and others that spring up in the heart. These should be considered, and so far as may be, removed. He who is deceived touching the truths of God's word, or concerning his own feelings, should have his error exposed. The most effectual way to disperse the darkness thrown around the mind is, to pour upon that mind the glory of truth. The sun of the Gospel can far more effectually do it than the feeble, twinkling lamp of human reason. Here, again, may be seen a fruitful field for the minister of Christ to cultivate.

The topics of the Pulpit are seen to be abundant, when we regard the fact that religion was designed to excite those who embrace it to exertion. Action is practical religion, and as it regards humanity, is the only really valuable religion. The world is not benefited by a piety that confines itself to the intellect and the heart—that practises seclusion—that makes a perfect monastery of one's incorporeal nature, inhabited only by the monks of religious sentiment and emotion ; but by a piety combining the energy of both the intellect and the heart, and making it to affect powerfully the interests of the race. And it should be one great object of the preacher to influence piety to transfuse itself into action. Obstacles to a life of constant spiritual effort are found in abundance, and which no *feeble* efforts can sweep from the soul and its path. They are found in that lingering depravity of the heart which tends to paralyze its sensibilities and disincline it to exertion ; in a native indolence that universally exists, in regard to spiritual things ; and in innumerable temptations, to which even the renewed are exposed, and which too often find in them a ready response. Hence, such considerations and views of truth as are calculated to meet these various phases of the mind's state should be brought forward, in their diverse forms, to secure the desired results. Men are to be aroused from the slumbers of indolence, a new animation is to be infused into their natures, and excited activities are to be guided into the right channel. To effect these objects, a thousand motives, drawn from every part of the universe, having a reference to the present and the future, and embracing, for their substance, the happiness of man and the glory of God, are to be brought to bear upon them.

Our general view, then, is this : We think of man's position as a revolted subject of God's moral government, and of the preacher's object. We consider the minister of Christ as Heaven's Ambassador, standing between the Sovereign and the subject. It is his great work, to bring rebels back to life and holiness, and in order to do so, he is to throw all the obstacles which truth affords him, into their present path towards death, and to employ all his powers of persuasion

upon them as voluntary and accountable. In doing this, he is to explain the designs of God, and inform them concerning the divine things embraced in his commission. And such combinations of truth are to be employed as in their practical applications will tend to create feeling and prompt to action. And we hesitate not to affirm, that a man of ordinary powers, with steady devotion to that labor of thinking which his calling requires, will furnish a sufficient variety in the subjects of his ministrations.

Faith, feeling, and action, as has already been intimated, constitute the grand trinity that is found in the unity of a complete, symmetrical, perfect religious character. To produce this faith, this feeling and this action, the preacher can lay the universe under tribute. On man he is to concentrate his forces—forces which, in the shape of principles, and illustrations, he can draw from the boundless fields of the intellectual, moral, and material creation. Beholding him a wanderer from Jehovah, and receding farther and farther each moment from his true home and allegiance, the preacher is to blend, in the remonstrances and invitations which he utters, the tones which are constantly issuing from every part of God's great system, and to urge him, by equally numerous, comprehensive and powerful considerations, to return to the bosom of Infinite Love.

It only remains for us to inquire briefly, on what this fulness in the instructions of the pulpit is dependent? Is there an art to be practised in connection with it? Is it to be a matter of particular study? We will dwell but a short time on this part of our topic.

One means of securing copiousness in preaching is the cultivation of ardent piety. While piety has more particular reference to the moral nature, it is unquestionably a quickener of the intellect. It can be shown on natural principles, that it purifies the whole man, and consequently improves, elevates, and administers an impulse to all his powers. It removes many obstacles that usually exist to a proper and healthy action of the mind. It opens the widest fields for thought to roam in, and the sublimest topics for thought to expend itself



upon. It puts the intellectual engine in good order, places it upon the right track, and furnishes it an effective and adequate motive power—a power drawn from the great Source of mind and of goodness. Often has it been observed, as a matter of fact; that a naturally dull and stupid intellect has exhibited, after conversion, new and strange vigor, developed unsuspected powers, and taken at once a comparatively elevated rank in the social state. The principle of piety has exerted a wonderful influence upon it.

The case of the minister of the Gospel is not an exception, in this respect. Ardent piety gives him the advantage to which we have referred, and if that piety be characterized by continual growth, the activity of his intellect, as well as his spiritual experiences and knowledge, must constantly increase. And under the influence of this two-fold improvement, there will be a freshness, unction and energy, given to his preaching that will command for it an attentive and interested hearing.

Indeed, it would seem that in this way alone truth can be invested with a permanent interest, as coming from the lips of the same man. If presented in the shape of dull, frigid intellectualities, it cannot enlist the feelings. Its aspects may be ever varying, and even startling and novel exhibitions of it may be made; but if they appeal only to the understanding, their power is necessarily limited and short-lived. A warm-hearted piety supplies this lack. The soul that soars daily to heaven on the wings of faith and prayer, and basks in the light that streams from the throne of God, and from that point of view surveys the moral harmonies and beauties of truth, is best qualified on its return to earth, as it mingles with men again, to discourse to them concerning what it has seen. It can recall, and present to the minds of others, its own celestial experiences. And though no powerful mental exertion may have been put forth in such an excursion upward, yet, coming down to our world with a bright and shining visage, as did Moses and Elias to the mount of transfiguration, the minister would fix the attention of his auditory, and maintain their interest in his preaching, by the assurance which

they would have, in such circumstances, that he "had been with Jesus." There is a strange fascination produced by the character and ministrations of one who holds communion with the skies. He carries with him an interest that can be accounted for only on the supposition that the nature of man is susceptible to the influence of the divine magnetism of a genuine, heaven-nourished devotion.

An increase of piety inclines the mind more and more to contemplate the truths which are so grateful to the soul. The preferences of the heart command the intellect. Thus there is not only an increased mental activity, but it is of such a kind, and goes in such a direction, as is best calculated to promote the end under consideration.

There can be no doubt, also, that ardent piety gives its possessor a more intimate acquaintance with human nature. It reveals his own heart to his view, and in doing so brings to light the otherwise hidden, secret elements that give form and character to the inclinations. And in thus becoming acquainted with himself, he becomes acquainted with others, for "as in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man." Thus piety in the minister enables him to adapt his instructions to the wants of his audience, and to vary them according to the demands of the ever-shifting moral phases that occur in their history.

It can hardly admit of a question, that, in many cases, piety supplies, to a very great extent, the want of superior talents and of large intellectual attainments. Many a man has been eminently useful in the ministry, and has ably and profitably served the same people, through a long course of years, who could boast neither of splendid abilities, nor of rich scholarship. He has had the important requisite of a holy heart and character, which have so governed his mind and ministrations as to secure noble ends in spite of the deficiencies alluded to. His exhibitions of divine truth may not have been so comprehensive and profound; the light which his mind shed upon God's word may not have been so clear and brilliant, intellectually; but he has made up, in great part, by those peculiar compensations which, as we have seen, are the product of a warm devoted piety.

But, without undervaluing eminent religious attainments, the importance of which we have just been considering, we are constrained to affirm that the great means of obtaining variety in pulpit instruction consists in mental culture and application, for it is the mind that is primarily employed in preaching. There must be study—intellectual effort. The minister cannot expect that God will help him in this work if he do not help himself. Indolence, in this respect, involves a violation of a law of the divine government, and no blessing can be reasonably looked for while it is indulged in. It is where mental exertion is found that piety comes in and affords the aid of her experiences, and renders more intense the efforts of the intellect. She calms, soothes and equalizes one's whole nature, and thus surrounds the mind with a clear atmosphere, through which its eye can gaze forth upon the field of truth. So that, other things being equal, that mind which is associated with, and under the influence of, ardent piety, is safest, clearest, and mightiest in its workings. The epistles of Paul, inspired though they were, give evidence not only that piety glowed like a fire in his soul, and thus administered an unwonted energy to the movements of his intellect, but that he had enjoyed a large culture, and that he by no means allowed his powers to run to waste. He doubtless practised himself what he recommended to Timothy, and studied "to show himself approved of God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." In other words, he made it a matter of thought, solicitude and study, how he could, in the most effectual manner, exhibit the truths which he had been commissioned by Christ to teach. He knew that the science of religion was, in many respects, like every other science, and that he who bestowed the most thought and attention upon it, in connection with the best aids at his command, would unquestionably have the most copious and comprehensive views of it. So those who have since been most successful in the ministry, especially in the pastoral office, have been characterized by a similar application of the mind to the great themes of religion. Jonathan Edwards was re-



markable in this respect ; and while his piety did much for him, the world would never have been blessed by his immortal theological treatises had he not directed his mind to the elucidation of divine truth by a rigid devotion to study. The same may be affirmed of Fuller, Hall, Chalmers, Emmons, and a host of others. Indeed, every man who has occupied the same pulpit for a long series of years, has been obliged to have recourse to mental application. This has, in every such instance, been one secret of his maintaining his position, for it would have been impossible for him to have done so, on any other terms. The variety in his instructions which enabled him to retain the respect of his people, and his hold upon their minds and hearts, has been secured only by keeping the brain actively employed.

We are disposed to lay stress upon this point ; but, we trust, not an undue one. Notwithstanding the high moral aims of the preacher, and that divine assistance which is promised him, his work is emphatically an intellectual work, and demands the earnest employment of the mind. In this way one can range through the broad field of religious truth, and present every variety of interesting combination. Mental discipline and fruitfulness of conception, especially if coupled with ardent piety, place a man upon a lofty eminence, from which he sees a bright sun shining with an eternal splendor and shedding its light upon the vast landscape spread out before him in its innumerable and diversified parts. They give him an eagle eye, so that from his proud elevation he can not only behold the great, the fundamental, the strongly-marked features of the prospect, but he can also see the nicer, the more delicate and the more remote objects, which conspire to give fulness and beauty to the spectacle. Such qualifications enable the Christian minister to dwell in a world of thought, in which there shall ever be new beauties to please the eye, and new pleasures to delight the soul.

## ARTICLE VII.—BISHOP COLENZO.

*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically considered.* By the  
RIGHT REV. JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D. D., Bishop of Natal.  
New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1863.

[BY REV. O. S. STEARNS, NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.]

WE doubt whether any book has appeared in the theological world during the last century, which has awakened so much discussion, and produced so many replies, as the little work of Colenso, Bishop of Natal, upon the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Already it has received more than fifty elaborate answers. Undoubtedly his position as a missionary from the Established Church of England to the Zulus in South Africa had much to do with giving it a precocious notoriety. Station, though short-lived in the realm of literature, always commands an immediate attention. Undoubtedly, the spirit of candid inquiry, which breathes through the preface of the book, incited to a candid and earnest perusal of it. Man, at his best, is a being of doubt and darkness, and welcomes any thread which promises to guide him in a right path. But we believe that neither the Bishop's position nor his ostensible frankness has given so much celebrity to his hasty conclusions as the moral state of the auditory to which he designed to address himself. In England, during the last twenty-five years, there has been generated, by a variety of

causes, a large class of men who glory in the "*nom de plume*" of free thinkers. Many of them are in the Church, and yet not of the Church. Having no sympathy with evangelical religion; desiring to live by the gospel while sapping its foundations; ambitious for benefices as places for ease, but not as positions for the promotion of spiritual well-being; they are ready to hail with a flourish of trumpets any co-worker who will risk his own reputation for consistency in the promotion of their choicest desires. They do not wish to be deposed from the sacred office of a bishop, nor to be silenced as Bishop Colenso has been. They are not prepared for such a sacrifice; but they are willing he should beat the bush, provided that they can catch the birds. Their entire animus is the animus of the destructive, and like boys shouting over the burning building, they join in the cry of joy over every fire which threatens the overthrow of that blessed revelation in which is reposed the Christian's hope. The book found a ready market, because the market was all prepared for it. The *Essays and Reviews*, begotten by men of like passions with himself, to whom he was ready to bow with supreme reverence, and from whom he has stolen much of his thunder, had gone before him to herald his coming. The learning of Oxford, the power of bishops and curates, the leading writers of the *Westminster Review*, the rationalism of country and city pulpits, and the speculative tendency of the laity in high and low positions, were all pledged to give it a free pass, as soon as it passed out of the hands of the printer and binder. Speculators were on the alert to coin money by the sale of it; and bookworms, filled with a kindred virus, brought out from the dust works of a similar spirit to act as its body guard. Scarcely was the book dry before Spinoza's work upon the Old Testament, *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which had been doomed "to dumb forgetfulness a prey," by being shut up to the Latin, and refused a birth in any other language, because of its injurious influence, found a translator, and was sent forth on its errand of destruction; and already we hear that a lady of England has become so enamored with the Bishop's endeavors, as to assume the responsibility of editing



the works of Theodore Parker, to slake the thirst of her thirsty countrymen. If the Bishop desired a sudden immortality, he has secured his wish. If he sought to put his thoughts in such a form that those for whom he wrote might thoughtlessly receive his opinion as law with regard to the gravest questions that have ever commanded the attention of man, he has been successful. There is a baldness and a boldness in the style of his book, a lowness and, if we may use the term, a filthiness of mind, as if gorging himself with details bordering upon obscenity, which caters to a class of readers who are ever too eager to catch at anything which may foster and strengthen their prejudices against the stern and pure spirit of revelation. Sometimes, as we have read page after page, it seemed as if we could see in the eye of the consecrated Bishop the leer of the Arch-deceiver himself, as looking up at us he said, "Yea! hath God said this?"

But we have no fear for the injurious effects of the book upon those who are unwilling to leap hastily to a conclusion upon so grave a matter as the historical character of the Pentateuch. They must be aware that there is too much at stake, thus to blind themselves with grains of sand. Destroy the truthfulness of the Pentateuch, and we annihilate the divine authority of the Bible. And they will not cast off such an anchor of hope, until after the most patient thought and the most prayerful investigation. If they cannot find the time nor the materials for performing the necessary labor for themselves, they will at least use the labors of others for the attainment of such an end. These labors have already been very abundant. If the Bishop himself was compelled to resort to works in English, to furnish him with his stock of stale objections against inspiration, good men and true, laymen as well as professors, were ready for him, forging their thunderbolts, not from translations, but from the originals of the best continental scholars. If the doctors in his own Church were startled from their slumbers by the crude thoughts of the Bishop, against which they seem neither to have prepared him nor themselves, the ground had long ago been traversed and examined by dissenters in both the old world and the

new. We have no fear for the fate of the Pentateuch when left in the hands of such men as John Collyer Knight, Isaac Taylor, and Professors Mahan and Greene. Even the article in *Household Words* is not a poor antidote. It is sometimes well to answer a fool according to his folly. It is Greek meeting Greek. Our only fear is that they who take the poison will not accept the cure.

We will leave, however, these general remarks, and pass to a notice of the book itself. The first impression it made upon us, after a first reading, was, that it contains nothing new. We are aware that the Bishop deems this fact an excellence rather than a defect. He says, in Part II., "The very point, indeed, of my argument in Part I. was this : that these difficulties were not *new*, though many of them were new to *me* when I first began to engage in these investigations. But I expressly said that these contradictions generally *had* been noticed by others, and *must* be noticed by every one who would carefully study the Pentateuch, comparing one statement with another." But our objection with regard to his work is not that there are no difficult passages in the Pentateuch, which cause the reader to pause, and review, and compare, and examine, before he moves on any farther. We admit, at first sight, very many of the difficulties suggested. We should expect to find them in any other document of a similar age. We believe these writings have been marvellously preserved. But we do not suppose that there has been an on-going miracle, these three thousand years, to cause these ancient documents to come down to us "without spot or wrinkle or any such thing." Nor do we suppose, because it is not to be expected, that in a revelation from an infinite God there will be nothing to startle a finite mind and try its faith. The Bible pretends to be supernatural in its origin, and of course to contain an account of supernatural facts ; and the man who has no sympathy with that idea, is neither prepared to sift its contents, nor to announce himself as a guide to its interpretation. Our objection, that the book contains nothing new, lies here. The same difficulties have been named for several centuries. They are, indeed, recent.

For nearly eleven centuries since the Christian era, they seem not to have troubled apologist or infidel. Perhaps keen-eyed science did not see then so distinctly or minutely as now. Josephus and Philo and the Fathers on the one hand, and Porphyry and Marcion and Julian on the other, were not troubled in their defence of the Pentateuch or their opposition to it, as is our Bishop. But from the days of Spinoza until now, its integrity has been assailed by the same or similar objections, and they have, in the main, been satisfactorily answered. The Bishop does not seem to have considered this fact in its true light. He knows of some answers to his positions, but he does not allow them their due weight. When he allows them, he does not treat them as scholar meets scholar, but as a panderer to the lowest of tastes. What was done with the excrements in Noah's ark, and what became of the offal in the Israelitish camp, are the staple of his troubles; troubling him as much as the passage of the Red Sea, or the waters that gushed from the rock at the beck of Moses' rod. This would do for Thomas Paine, who confessed that he never read the Bible through in all his life; but for a man who pretends to be a scholar, and to act as the translator of the Bible from the Hebrew into the Zulu language, it is unworthy of his office, and reveals a predetermined desire to destroy what he could never build up.

We look upon Spinoza as the father of modern infidelity with respect to the integrity of the Pentateuch. A Jew himself, a self-made scholar, a pantheist at heart and in his philosophy, following some suggestions from the Rabbis of his own day and a little time previous, he took hold of the books of the Old Testament very good naturedly, and sought to annul their generally received chronology, for the sake of rejecting the claims of the Messiah. His chief object is to prove that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. He does not deny that he is assumed to be the author, nor that he has been generally acknowledged as the author. But he thinks that Ezra was the compiler of the books, and called them the Books of Moses to give them currency. He quotes a mystical passage from Eben Ezra as the foundation of his



scepticism, and has much to say about the Canaanite's being in the land, the anachronism about Og, king of Bashan, the last part of Deuteronomy, the use of the name Dan before he entered into his possessions, and many such things; but, what is worthy of special notice, never denies the truthfulness of the principal events which are there recorded. This was true, generally, of those who preceded him, and of those who followed him. The attack was made upon the authorship rather than upon the contents. The contents were very stubborn things. There was a people whose entire historic life was wrapped up in them. This people lived, though the books were deemed dead. This people by their habits, customs, rites, ceremonies, feasts, songs and religion were a monument to the past, every stone of which was dug out of that old quarry. And it was useless to deny it. Who created the quarry might be a question. Hence Ptolemy the Gnostic disputed the genuineness of the Pentateuch, on the ground that the divine law was too sublime for that early age. He says it was partly given by Moses, and partly by the elders of the nation. The Nazarenes and Clementines did the same. They struck at whatever in the narrative displeased them. Celsus, it is true, called the historical portions myths; and paralleled them with fables, but the rest laid their mine under the authorship. We are not specially troubled about the authorship. Personally we are satisfied upon that point. But we deem it the most assailable place of attack. The Bishop himself, we judge, thinks so, inasmuch as he has given an entire volume to what has been so long called the document-hypothesis. As to that theory we have nothing to say now, his first effort being all we wish to consider at this time; except to quote from a recent writer, who, speaking of this hypothesis, seems to have judged it according to its merits. He says: "We have before us a Hebrew Bible, colored so as to represent to the eye this singular species of Mosaic (literally, however, what is *non*-Mosaic), formed in accordance with the findings of its two latest representatives—Vaihinger and Dr. Davidson. The handwriting of the Elohist, as forming the ground-element of the whole, stands in the native black and

white; the pre-Elohist of Vaihinger, the junior Elohist of Davidson, is tinged with yellow; the Jehovist is marked in blue; the Redactor shines in red; and certain portions; which are so mixed that the higher criticism has not yet succeeded in disentangling the component elements, are streaked with various hues, leaving them to be reckoned, meanwhile, as a community of goods. The result is the most ridiculous and grotesque-looking thing, in the shape of a literary composition, that can well be imagined. Some of the pages remind one of the gay and chequered appearance of a piece of Scotch tartan—so frequently and sharply does one color alternate with another, sometimes as many as fifteen or sixteen varieties in a page. . . . The mere exhibition in our halls of learning of such a parti-colored Bible as the one before us would go far, we are convinced, to expose the folly of these attempts, and lead those who have learning enough to read the Scriptures in the original tongue, and the sterling commodity of common sense to use it, to estimate at their proper value the pretensions and results of the criticism in question."

But we have said there is nothing new in this book. Let us look at its contents. Is it anything new for a man when reading of the descent into Egypt by the family of Jacob, to see that in one place the whole number of souls is said to be sixty-six, and in the very next verse is said to be seventy?—We suppose the writer himself knew there was a difference between these two numbers, as well as the Zulu Bishop. He certainly must have been a fool if he did not; for the two numbers occur in one and the same sentence. There are two or three methods of accounting for this discrepancy, any one of which relieves the statements from the charge of contradiction. So, too, "the size of the court of the tabernacle compared with the number of the congregation," which forms the ground of another huge objection, may have brought some trouble to other minds as well as to that of Colenso. Nobody ever supposed, however, that when the command was given that the whole assembly should be gathered unto "the door of the tabernacle," every man, woman and child could enter

it, or would enter it; any more than when from twenty pulpits it is announced that "this congregation is invited to meet in a given place on a given time," any one place would contain them all without suffocation; while each of the congregations so invited might be easily represented. Nor is it anything new for a reader to stop and question with himself, whether it was possible for the priest to "carry" all refuse without the camp, and burn it; yet he knows that what is done by another, in matters of business, is often the same as though done by one's self. "Possibly," says Mahan, "if the contract were made in English, a matter-of-fact jury, with a Colenso to prosecute and a Shylock to expound the law, might so interpret the bond. But the Hebrew Priest was secured against such a mishap by the fact that the command to carry forth and burn is in the causative mood; literally he shall "cause to go forth"—a distinction which would have saved him in the eyes of Shylock, who knew something of Hebrew, if not in those of Bishop Colenso." And as to the offal, which troubles the Bishop so much as to cause him to devote a whole chapter to his "vile jokes"—query: Might they not have used a "city-cart," or even a "night-cart"? Is it anything new, that when in the wilderness, shortly after the passage of the Red Sea, the people are commanded "to take every man for them which are in his *tents*," referring to the distribution of the manna, a reader should stop and ask himself, where they got so many tents? But a second thought will assure him that the narrative does not imply that they all had tents, and a third thought will tell him that there had been ample time in Egypt, and, after the Exodus, to provide, by the handiwork of the Hebrew girls in the weaving of hair-cloth, for all they can justly be supposed to have needed. How he leaps to his conclusions! "Two millions of people," he says, "would require 200,000 tents. How then did they acquire them?" "Further, if they had these tents, how could they have carried them?" "This would require five hundred thousand oxen, even if the tents were made of the lightest modern materials, whereas the Hebrew tents, we must suppose, were made of skins, and were therefore much heavier." "Thus



they would have needed for this purpose two hundred thousand oxen." Surely he has a fertile imagination!

We grant him, however, the position of novelty in one passage. Referring to the appearance of the children of Israel when they went up out of Egypt, he says they went up "armed or in battle array." He has not determined which; though there is quite a difference in the two terms. Soldiers, on their way to Washington in the cars, may be said to be going "armed," but hardly in "battle array." Assuming that the word translated "harnessed," means "armed," "how inconceivable it is," he says, "that Pharaoh should have allowed an oppressed people, numbering six hundred thousand, to possess arms; ready as they would thus be at a moment's warning to rise up and overthrow him. And then if they went up in battle array, five in a rank, they would have formed a column sixty-eight miles long." We grant the absurdity, and acknowledge the freshness of the exposition. But for a Bishop, "less than two years old" in such studies, to array himself against the veteran Gesenius as to the meaning of this word מִלְחָמָה, presupposes a hardihood, which will not brook explanations, when once it has determined to remove an obstacle from its path. Every one should know that the word may mean "to go out with an impetuous haste;" and if it be thought to be a numerical statement, it would imply a division of the host into five parts or corps. We do not know, though we confess that we were not aware of it before, but there is something new as to the statements of the narrative concerning the passover. Colenso finds difficulties which stamp the narrative as entirely unhistorical. Eight pages are occupied in showing us that it was impossible that a notice of this festival could have been given to two millions of people in a single day; that the women could borrow of the Egyptians their jewels, because of their remoteness; and that they could have found lambs sufficient for the offering; while on the very face of the story they had four days in which to notify each other, they had long before been told by Moses to secure spoils from the Egyptians; and as to the offerings there can be no trouble when we consider that the Hebrew life had been, was then

and continued to be nomadic. This is the essence of Bishop Colenso's error. "Instead of consulting the Bible on its own terms, and according to its own law, he makes a private oracle of it, and finds it fallible. He tries it, not by catholic rules, but by principles and rules vehemently Colensic. He interprets it, not by the common sense of the Church, but by Bishop Colenso's sense, or by that of some 'intelligent Christian native,' a disciple of Bishop Colenso.\*

We care, however, very little, whether the difficulties which the Bishop finds in the Pentateuch are new or old. They do not shake our faith in the truthfulness of the Bible as a whole. We can conceive of difficulties, graver and more insurmountable than any he has named, and yet with the affidavit of our blessed Lord and Master, and his inspired apostles, who, as yet, have not been convicted of any error as to their judgment of the genuineness of the Old Testament, of which the Pentateuch is the chief corner-stone, we could rest calmly for the removal of those difficulties either by the progress of knowledge, or by the necessities of the case. The narrative of the creation, the death of Abel, the fact of the temptation and fall, the Noachian flood, the destruction of Sodom, the personality of Abraham, the calling of Moses, the credibility of the law as given by Moses, the rite of circumcision, the healing of the people by the brazen serpent, the manna, the passover, the authoritative position of Moses, the inspiration of Moses, the thorough historic character of the Lawgiver both as to life and position, and the intimate association of that early mission of the Hebrew with his own, are all so strongly endorsed by the Son of God, that we should be compelled to yield the entire frame work of salvation through him, were we to allow that the Pentateuch was merely a series of "old wives' fables." And as to the testimony of the apostles, whom we consider as under the direction of the infallible Spirit, the troublesome genealogies are made the line of descent for the Messiah both by Matthew and Luke; the creation and the fall are asserted by Peter and Paul; the sacrifice and death

---

\* Mahan, p. 37.

of Abel are testified to by John and the author of the Hebrews; the flood and destruction of Sodom are attested by Peter and Jude; the stories of Abraham and Melchizedek, Hagar and Ishmael, Sarah and Isaac, Rebecca and Esau, Joseph and the Hebrews in Egypt, of Moses and the plagues, and the pass-over; the accounts of the passage of the Red Sea and the tabernacle, of the terrors of Sinai and the gift of manna, of the gushing water from the rock and the overthrow of the people in the wilderness, of their idolatry and their fornication, of their tempting God, and of the fiery serpents, of their murmuring and long wanderings, of the destruction of the Canaanites, and of the inheritance of the promised land; are all not only asserted by them, but thrown into the face of the very people who had the records in their own hands, and must have known as thoroughly as the Bishop to the Zulus, whether those things were true or false. If they were false, why did they not deny them, and upheave Christianity when it was a seedling. If they were true, their silence is a swift witness against modern objectors and cavillers.

We do not deny that there are difficulties to be encountered; difficulties which try our faith. And yet they do not disturb our faith. We expected to find them, and we do find them. But we deem it an easy faith which can be balked by slight discrepancies in dates, names, and numbers. And yet these are all, when the fact of supernaturalism is allowed where it is claimed. The question of historical veracity does not depend upon an assumed chronology, nor an assumed authorship; it is not whether the facts related are natural or supernatural; but whether they are true. For their truthfulness we may depend upon the air of simplicity which breathes through the document; the general drift of the story; the cropping out anywhere and everywhere of one ruling idea; the alliance of testimony; the subsequent historical prominence of a people as the natural development in customs and religion of an antecedent birthright; the researches of science so far as they are reliable for a testimony to the condition of a nation in an early age; the rites and customs of peoples occupying the same territory and carrying out the same local habits;



the straight forward, business-like, sin-condemning and purity-approving spirit, bearing the reader onward as on an eagle's wing; the precision and nicety of its statements in all numerical statistics; its correspondence with human nature; its fearless and impartial tone against all wrong in high or low places; these, and such things as these, would stamp any ancient document historically correct, and in these several particulars we believe the Pentateuch defies the attacks of all the missionary bishops in Heathendom.

The bishop, however, throws all this positive evidence for the credibility of the Pentateuch to the winds, and contents himself with playing the part of the wood-pecker, who feeds upon the worms lodging in dead and useless wood. He plumes himself upon his mathematics. He is the Bishop of Numbers. He has become the Bishop of Exodus; rather unwillingly, however. He has not fully decided whether to accept a miracle upon the best of testimony, or not. He thinks he believes in a divine revelation; but on what grounds it is impossible to see. He thinks he has found a revised gospel, but who sat for the original doth not appear. He is not prepared to deny the doctrine of inspiration, but it is an inspiration common to the Sikhs and Buddhists, as well as to Moses and Paul. No one's faith need be disturbed by a man who ignores the main scope of a book, and blinds himself to its authorized credentials, thinking he has destroyed its vital kernel because he has pricked himself with a few of its burrs. Truth is the daughter of time. It is not born of the brain-throes of two years, in matters so weighty as those with which he deals. Let it be granted that the number of the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus, the number of the people at the first muster compared with the poll-tax raised six months afterward, and the number of soldiers in the war with Midian are troublesome numbers; in the first and third instances seemingly very large, and in the second instance looking like a discrepancy in the different statements; if there are hypotheses by which they may be reconciled, and these hypotheses have received the approval of learned men, heterodox as well as orthodox, are we to reject an entire series of

books sustaining their veracity in a hundred other ways, for such questionable reasons? The Hebrew delighted in round numbers. We find it so in the New Testament as well as the Old. We Americans do the same. This will account for some of the apparent discrepancies. The Hebrew copyist, seeing a difference in the numbers, may have sought to reconcile them with each other, and by the adjustment made them too large or too small. He may have erred, but it is difficult for us to go behind him and correct him by comparing his labors with older manuscripts. The oldest Hebrew manuscripts now known to be extant, dates A. D. 1106. Others are supposed to be older, but only by conjecture. Of private manuscripts none are older than five centuries. We have extracts from the "eight exemplars," celebrated for their correctness and value, but they are nought but extracts. We have several Greek versions of the Old Testament, but they are of little aid in the point now under consideration. No one pretends that the text of the Old Testament is free from mistakes. No theory of inspiration demands that it be immaculate when put into our hands at this day. The copyists might be deceived by their eyes, their ears, or their memory, and yet nothing essential, nothing vital be lost to us. Every one who has tried to write Hebrew has been convinced of this. And still we would say that it is, as it is, marvellously pure. We only say, that in a matter so slightly important as numbers and names, where the liability to error is so strong, we wonder that the Argus-eyed Bishop has not encountered more serious trouble than what he has brought forward. And we wish to add, while on this subject, that neither he nor we can go beyond the manuscripts now in our possession. We are shut up unto this faith. If we had as many, and in proportion to the age as early, versions of the Old Testament as we have of the New, possibly we might remove some of these apparent discrepancies. Undoubtedly with respect to chronological dates, further historical research may shed some light upon the darkness. We must, however, take things as they are, and not be shaken by zephyrs.

To illustrate what we have said, let us look at an hypothesis

which may answer the Bishop's difficulty as to the number of "harnessed men" who went up out of Egypt at the time of the Exodus. He says: "The twelve sons of Jacob had between them 53 sons, that is, on the average,  $4\frac{1}{2}$  each. Let us suppose that they increased in this way from generation to generation. Then in the *first* generation, that of Kohath, there would be 54 males (according to the story, 53, or rather only 51, since Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, without issue); in the *second*, that of Amram, 243; in the *third*, that of *Moses and Aaron*, 1,094; and in the *fourth*, that of *Joshua and Eleazar*, 4,923; that is to say, instead of 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, there could not have been 5,000." This is very good arithmetic but not very good sense. A young apple tree has borne four apples this year, therefore next year it will bear 16, the next 64, and in the fourth year 256. Its bearing capacity is to be measured by its youth rather than by its age. He assumes that a generation must be no more than 50 years, in the face of the best authorities that it included a century; he assumes that the time of the sojourn was 215 years, in the face of Ewald, who allows it to have been 430; he assumes that there were no servants in these patriarchal households, whose rate of increase may have been as great as their masters certainly, in the face of the contrary statements as to the families of Abraham and Isaac, copied most likely by Jacob and his children; he assumes that no Egyptians joined themselves to these people of God, either for the sake of marriage or religion; he assumes that God is not faithful to his promises, in the face of the divine assertion that the descendants of Abraham should be fruitful beyond all national precedents; and then, on the grounds of these assumptions, establishes his hypothesis, that the number of warriors who went up out of Egypt could not have exceeded 5,000.

Now let us look at the estimate of Keil with reference to this very subject; certainly a man who had no very strong predilections to make out a case, but a scholar who is disposed to give history its due. He says: "If we deduct from the seventy souls who went down into Egypt, the patriarch Jacob, his twelve sons, Dinah, and Serah, the daughter



of Asher, and in addition, the three sons of Levi, the four grandsons of Judah, and Benjamin (Asher?), and those grandsons of Jacob who probably died without male offspring, inasmuch as their descendants do not occur among the families of Israel (see Num. xxvi.), there will remain forty-one grandsons of Jacob (besides the Levites), who founded families. If now, according to I. Chron. vii: 20, etc., where ten or eleven generations are named from Ephraim to Joshua, we reckon forty years to a generation, the tenth generation of the forty-one grandsons of Jacob would be born about the 400th year of the residence in Egypt, and consequently be about twenty years old at the Exodus. Supposing that in the first six of these generations every married couple had, on an average, three sons and three daughters, and in the last four generations each married couple had two sons and two daughters, there would have been in the tenth generation, about the 400th year of the descent into Egypt, 478,224 sons, who could be over twenty years of age at the Exodus, whilst 125,326 men of the ninth generation might be still living, and consequently  $478,224 + 125,326 = 603,550$  men over twenty years old could leave Egypt," an hypothesis if it be but an hypothesis, amply sufficient to meet the exigencies of the case, and sufficient, at any rate, to prove with regard to the Bishop that "*quem Deus vult perdere, prius dementat.*" Nearly all of the remaining difficulties of Colenso can be answered as satisfactorily. We had noted others, but our paper is already too long.

There is one, however, which is worthy of attention. The Bishop is troubled about the supplies for people and cattle, while sojourning in the desert. Rejecting in heart, if not in words, the idea of the miraculous, this is not surprising. We credit the miraculous, because we think there is ample proof of it, and because it is woven into the entire fabric of the narrative. Miraculous food, miraculous drink, miraculous life, miraculous death, miraculous law and miraculous guidance meet us on almost every page. We have little faith, however, in the supposed changes which have been wrought in the neighborhood of Sinai by the progress of time, so that

what would once have supported a large and thrifty people cannot do it now. We rather incline to the belief that the land in the main was desert then, as it is now. There may have been some change, though not much. They were taken there for trial. Their absolute needs were supplied. They were to indulge in no luxuries. They were to live "from hand to mouth." Had they been faithful to God, their admission into Canaan would have been earlier. As it was, they were swept away by natural laws, under the scourge of God. It was a dry and thirsty land where no water was, and in passing through it by such a lingering, meandering route, they melted away, visited for their own sins, by the pinching poverty of the land.

We confess that when this book first appeared before the American public, and it received so rapid a sale, a cursory reading impressed us with the fear that it would do much harm. We feared it would shock a certain class of timid and yet reverent minds, causing them to believe that the foundations of truth were about to fall; while it would cause the sceptical to become still more sceptical. Our fears have subsided daily, like the waters of the flood, as we have repeatedly perused it, and examined the passages on which rests its theory. It was begotten like a house-plant. It will die like a mushroom. It will accomplish a purpose—a far nobler one than its author intended. In his former diocese it will be refuted step by step, and the poor ignorant Zulus will become wiser than their teacher. Around the Cape of Good Hope it is now inspiring the clergy to cast out the old leaven of unrighteousness, and put in the new leaven of faith and good works. It is causing men in high places to think upon sacred topics as never before: to find out what they do believe, and gather up their ammunition and supplies for a fresh attack. In the old world and the new it will furnish a starting-point whence the credentials of the Old Testament will be sifted and settled as thoroughly as possible. The battle has been raging around the New Testament for a long time. The foe has been met and conquered. Its authority rests upon a more solid basis to-day than ever before. De-

niers have become converts. Believers hold up their heads. And now the scene of the contest changes, but the victory is as sure. Hengstenberg said, years ago, "that the next conflict with the doctrines of revelation would be waged around the earlier books of the Bible." He probably spoke from personal experience. His first academical performance was a thesis in which he undertook to show that to look for Christ in the Old Testament was the merest folly. His recantation from this folly is written in the very title of his great performance, "*CHRISTOLOGY, or the doctrine of Christ as taught in the Old Testament.*" Many more as well as he are now preaching the faith they once destroyed. This is God's plan with individuals, his Church, and the nations. He shakes them, terribly shakes them, that they may know that there is no foundation so solid as his Rock. If the orations of Cicero which Wolf rejected are now received as genuine—if the same has been true with portions of Plato's writings,—if the eighth book of Thucydides, which was set aside as spurious, on account of a diversity of style and spirit, has been vindicated by Niebuhr, upon grounds which would triumphantly restore Deuteronomy to its place with Genesis, we have no fear but that these earliest documents, containing the only reliable history of the world, will pass through its present ordeal, having this seal upon it, that "God is true." On the whole, therefore, we believe that these labors of Bishop Colenso will do, in the end, more good than harm.



## ARTICLE VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

## THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

*Les Perspectives du Temps Présent. Quatrième série de Discours prononcés à Genève par le Comte Agénor de Gasparin.* Paris: Ch. Meyreuis & Cie. 1860. pp. 508.

COUNT DE GASPARIN'S interest in our national struggle, and his just appreciation of the real causes of the conflict, have made his name well known in America. In France and French Switzerland his older and wider reputation has been that of a defender of Christianity and the Bible against the assaults of the Rationalists. In this service he has written several works, among which should be specially mentioned, "*Les Ecoles du Doute et l'Ecole de la Foi*," a large octavo volume which has done not a little in stemming the current of Neology, which for the last twelve years has been pouring in upon the Protestant Churches of France. The present volume belongs to the same class of works; it is the fourth series of lectures which, at the request of the evangelical party, he has delivered in the city of Calvin. It contains three discourses of more than usual length, entitled: "Our Perils," "Our Strength," and "Our Hopes."

We cannot enter into the particulars of the defence of the authority of the Scriptures which these discourses make; it will suffice to say, that it is able and yet popular, and well calculated to vindicate the "truth as it is in Jesus" from the attacks of its enemies. But there are certain admissions and statements in the discourses which should not be overlooked. They explain the origin of Mr. Wolff's wretched book on Baptism, originally written for French Switzerland, and so justly, and effectively reviewed in our last number.

Count de Gasparin, in his unprejudiced study of the New Testament,

has been led to adopt the distinctive views of Baptists, though he has not yet, so far as we are aware, avowed himself as one of their number. A few extracts from the discourses will not be without interest to our readers.

In speaking against the abuse of the confessions of faith which, in the Churches of the Reformation, have been like Procrustean beds, and yet not preventing the birth of all sorts of error, our author calls every one to the Source of Light and Truth, and adds: "Perfection upon this point seems to have been realized, first in the primitive Churches which knew only one rule, the Scriptures of the Old Testament explained and completed by the teachings of the Apostles, and, in our day, among the Baptist Churches, which also acknowledge only one rule, the Bible. Add to this the solemn question propounded to those who wish to join by baptism: Dost thou believe in the Lord Jesus Christ? and in this double fact, the profession of a faith which is the equivalent to conversion, and the absolute authority of the Word of God, you will have no difficulty in finding the most beautiful, the most positive, and the surest confession of faith."

He expresses the hope that the time will soon come when the question of Baptism will cease to be discussed, and when it will be thought strange that it was ever a matter of controversy. "It is not the time," he continues, "to treat of this subject; I will simply say that we are advancing, and that the Scriptures will soon resolve this problem as all others. Sacraments in general will be divested of their ambiguous and mysterious nature, even the word "Sacrament" will doubtless disappear, and we shall find ourselves, like the first Christians, in the presence of two ceremonies, as simple as they are august, by which the child of God manifests his faith, and is confirmed in the same."

There are two or three other passages in the volume written in the same spirit, which show that the learned Count holds views very similar to those of Baptists on Baptism and Church organization. He is not alone in this. Many a young theologian in France and Switzerland has lost faith in infant baptism as a divine requirement, but is waiting, we know not for what, unless it be a movement under proper leadership, to conform fully his practice to his views.

It cannot be long before such manly and truthful utterances as these of Count de Gasparin shall have produced their legitimate results, and Christianity, freed from traditional interpretation and ecclesiastical bondage, shall once again stand forth in its primitive purity and power.

*A Collection of Theological Essays from various Authors.* With an introduction by GEORGE R. NOYES, D. D., Professor of Sacred Literature in Harvard University. Third edition. Boston: Walker, Wise and Co. Published for the American Unitarian Association. 1860. 12mo., pp. xlvi., 512.

THE third edition of these Essays found a much larger circle of readers than the first. The commotion excited by the "Essays and Reviews," three of whose authors occupy no inconsiderable space in this collection, served to prepare for it an attentive public. The idea of the collection was first suggested to the editor by Prof. Jowett's Commentary on the Epistles of Paul, dissertations from which occupy nearly two hundred pages of his volume. Rowland Williams, Baden Powell, A. P. Stanley, Tholuck and Guizot, furnish, with three or four essays from older and less current authors, the remainder of the collection. Tholuck does service in an essay made up of his famous papers on Inspiration, published in 1850-1, and translated for Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature in 1854, and Stanley comes in in various dissertations from his Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians.

The volume is avowedly compiled for the use of students in divinity, Sabbath-school teachers, and intelligent readers generally; men of reading and scholars being supposed to have been familiar with its contents in the sources from which they have been derived. That ordinary Sabbath-school teachers should be benefited by such discussions is preposterous, but that all intelligent readers, that is, readers who are acquainted with both sides of the questions involved, should be instructed by them, and that to those especially who are desirous of understanding the present state of theological opinion in England and this country, they should even be accounted indispensable, we can readily admit.

The volume was, of course, made up in the interests of Unitarianism. But, with the exception of the Introduction by the editor, and of the extracts from Jowett, for the sake of which, to be sure, the other essays were brought together, and which, manifestly, in the editor's estimation are the choice portions of the volume, there is but little from which a modern trinitarian will have occasion seriously to dissent. The most objectionable piece in the book is the Introduction. It characterises briefly the several essays, indicating the sources whence they are drawn, but is devoted chiefly to a historical statement and discussion of several theories of the Atonement that have been held by Protestants, particularly in New England, and to a vindication of the theory commonly held by Unitarians. The substitution, or



Anselmic theory, he pronounces "appalling," and, as commonly represented, "horrible." "The very statement of this theory by some distinguished theologians, shocks the feelings of many Christians like the language of impiety." For the governmental theory, so prevalent in New England, and which regards the death of Christ as reformatory and not punitive, he has but little higher regard. "So far as the Divine character is concerned, it is of little consequence whether you call the sufferings of Christ *punishment*, or only *torture immediately inflicted by God* for the mere purpose of being contemplated by intelligent beings."

To an orthodox believer in the sacrificial and atoning efficacy of the death of Christ, his interpretation of certain Old Testament texts, as well as of sundry New Testament passages, is bald and jejune enough. Thus the language in the cry of desertion on the cross, "had substantially the same meaning when uttered by Christ as when uttered by the Psalmist;" the phrase "servant of God," in Isaiah liii., "denotes, at least in its primary sense, the Jewish Church, the Israel of God, who suffered on account of the sins of others, in the time of the captivity at Babylon;" and Christ was "set forth to be a propitiation for sin," in a sense different from that in which the Apostles suffered, only in the "greater prominence, importance and influence assigned by Paul and other New Testament writers to the sacrifice of Christ, than to that of other righteous men."

*The Risen Redeemer: The Gospel History from the Resurrection to the Day of Pentecost.* By F. W. KRUMMACHER, D. D., Author of "*Elijah the Tishbite*." Translated from the German by JOHN T. BETTS, with the sanction of the author. New York: Robert Carter & Brother. 1863. 12mo., pp. 298.

WE hardly know of another German author of so little real worth—whose writings have been so long, so favorably, and so generally known among us as Krummacher. There is, however, in all he writes, a certain vividness and freshness of thought, a success in re-clothing and making real the brief words of Scripture, which give a charm to his thoughts even after their transfer into a foreign tongue. Those who have read the "*Suffering Saviour*," translated and published some six years since, will be desirous of reading the "*Risen Redeemer*," which so appropriately follows it. The translator, while singularly happy in the use of idiomatic English, occasionally allows himself the use of terms and phrases which, though current among many writers, are eschewed by

the more careful and accurate. Kummacher nas, however, been remarkably fortunate in those who have rendered him into English.

*Speaking to the Heart; or, Sermons for the People.* By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D. D., Author of the "*Gospel in Ezekiel*," etc. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1863. 12mo. pp. 216.

DR. GUTHRIE is a spirited writer as well as a popular preacher. Direct and explicit in his statements, skillful in his use of imagery and illustration, earnest in purpose, and devout in spirit, he holds his readers, as he does his hearers, attentive to his thoughts. "*Speaking to the Heart*" contains sermons which appear to have been selected and arranged on no other principle than that of being fitted for usefulness by their directness, simplicity, and unction.

*The Sympathy of Christ with Man; Its Teaching and its Consolation.* By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D. D., Author of "*The Precious Things of God*," "*Memoir of Mary Winslow*," "*Help Heavenward*," etc., etc. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 1863. 12mo. pp. 426.

*Patriarchal Shadows of Christ and his Church: As Exhibited in Passages drawn from the History of Joseph and his Brethren.* By OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1863. 12mo., pp. 402.

DR. WINSLOW is one of those English authors whose writings have not seemed to us to be entitled to the reputation they have had in America. A most excellent Christian spirit, it is true, breathes through all that comes from his pen, and his thoughts are always the dictates of good sense, but when you have made these admissions, there is little more that can justly be added. He is personally one of the most estimable of men, and, withal, a most diligent and faithful pastor, but it has been on insufficient grounds, we think, that he has been led to suppose that thoughts which have interested and instructed his admiring parishioners should have wider circulation. The fact that the circulation has been such as to warrant him in repeating the experiment of publication, would seem to justify his judgment. But popularity never yet was a safe test of the merit or usefulness of either a man or a book.

"*The Sympathy of Christ with Man*" is a series of discourses illustrative of the theme which forms the title of the volume; and "*Patri-*

*archal Shadows*" is the designation of a collection of week-day lectures on topics furnished in the lives of Joseph and his brethren.

*The New Testament, with Brief Explanatory Notes, or Scholia.* By HOWARD CROSBY, D. D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in Rutgers College, and formerly Professor in the University of the City of New York. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

THIS is not a commentary, but an edition of the English Testament with very brief and rather meagre foot notes. The notes "are intended simply to remove the surface difficulties of the text," dealing only with grammar, rhetoric and archæology. What special deficiency in the numerous class of books devoted to the explanation of Scripture Dr. Crosby proposed to remedy, does not appear. In our cursory examination of the notes we have failed to discover those evidences of fresh gleanings from the well trodden field, which seem to us to warrant their publication; but their author has undoubtedly labored with some particular class of Bible students in mind, and to them, we doubt not, the book will prove both acceptable and profitable.

*Triumphs of the Bible: with the Testimony of Science to its Truth.*

By Rev. HENRY TULLIDGE, A. M. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand street. 12mo. pp. 439.

MR. TULLIDGE has made remarkably free use of the writings of others. More than one half of his volume consists of quotations and extracts from a large number of authors. He has succeeded in compiling a book that may be of service to the young and unread, who are specially endangered by the writings of sceptics. The chief object at which he has aimed has been to show the harmony of Science and Revelation, and thus to vindicate the truth and divine authority of the Bible. "*Triumphs of the Bible*" is merely the heading of what he styles Part I., but which in fact is only an introductory essay, consisting of less than a sixth of the whole volume. A critical reader, familiar with the present state of the physical sciences and of sacred chronology, will have occasion frequently to demur at the confident tone and dogmatic statements of the author. Questions over which the profoundest and most patient inquirers are still in suspense, are assumed by him to have received full and satisfactory answers. As a sufficient answer to the flippant assertions of popular scepticism, the book may be put with advantage into the hands of the immature and uninformed, but that



intelligent doubters will be relieved by it, or that honest but erring and well read inquirers will be led by it to faith in the Scriptures, there is not so much reason as we could wish for believing. It attempts too much, and is by far too positive where science is yet uncertain.

*Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel.* By FRANCIS WAYLAND. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

WHATEVER proceeds from the pen of Dr. Wayland will command attention. He always conceives clearly and states strongly, though not always with due qualification. The Christian ministry is a subject on which he has thought long and felt deeply; and when now, in his retirement after a life of protracted usefulness, he gives utterance to his thoughts and convictions, it is but natural that they should command very general attention. We commend the book to the careful perusal of both ministers and laymen, though in so doing we are far from intending to intimate our unqualified subscription to all its contents. It is full of useful hints to the minister, and is so mellow with genuine Christian spirit that no one can read it without profit.

The letters are addressed to the venerable Deacon Heman Lincoln, at whose urgent solicitation they were written, and with whom, in friendly intercourse, the author has undoubtedly frequently exchanged the sentiments they contain. There are many things in these letters to which we should be glad to allude, but we must forbear. The whole subject of which they treat is one of so much importance that we may hereafter recur to it again more at length.

*Parish Papers.* By NORMAN MACLEOD, [D. D., one of Her Majesty's Chaplains for Scotland; Author of "Wee Davie," "The Gold Thread," etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1863. 12mo., pp. 328.

WHETHER these papers are called Parish Papers because, in another form, they served originally for parish instruction from the pulpit, or simply because dedicated to the author's parishioners, we are not informed. They could all, however, in no very different form, have done service in the pulpit, and yet are not unworthy of publication. The first three papers, and by far the longest, are entitled, severally, "Thoughts on Christianity," "Thoughts upon the final Judgment," "Thoughts upon Future Life;" a dozen shorter and more informal ones on appropriate themes make up the remainder of the collection. The whole constitute a volume of sound instruction conveyed in a style that is at once natural, nervous and agreeable.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church.* Part I., Abraham to Samuel. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. With Maps and Plans. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863. 8vo., pp. xl., 572.

WHOEVER has looked into Dr. Stanley's "Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church" will need no encouragement to examine these on the History of the Jewish Church. The two volumes differ only in the nature of the subjects of which they treat. Skilfully as he has portrayed distinguished characters and events in the Eastern Church, he has been even more successful in his pictures of the worthies and scenes of early Jewish history. Old Testament personages, with whom Bible history had apparently made us as well acquainted as with household friends, are presented in lights which, while preserving their familiar features, give us new views of their inner life, habits and characters.

Though Dr. Stanley belongs unmistakably to the progressive school of English divines, there is but little of positive statement in these lectures that need offend a believer in plenary inspiration. His spirit is totally foreign to that of the Essayists and Reviewers. He is always devout and reverent, always intent in the pursuit of truth rather than in the support of party. For the most part he has avoided the topics, and even the incidental questions, on which the progressive party have been most offensive, and wherever these have stood in his way he has been studiously guarded in his language. His guarded words have been prompted, not by a truckling, cowardly spirit, but by that calm prudence which is ever the characteristic of true scholarship, and that love of truth which should ever be uppermost in the Christian's bosom. We read in his Preface: "Discussions of chronology, statistics, and physical science,—of the critical state of the different texts and the authorship of the different portions of the narration,—of the precise limits to be drawn between natural and supernatural, providential and miraculous,—unless in passages where the existing documents and the existing localities force the consideration upon us,—I have usually left unnoticed." But wherever he has been forced to speak, there has been no ambiguity in his language. His solution of many a difficult question would unquestionably be that of the rationalist. Nor would he

deprecate the discussion, by proper persons and in a right spirit, of these questions, though in these Lectures he has so carefully avoided them; on the contrary, his words are: "It is my firm conviction that in proportion as such inquiries are fearlessly pursued by those who are able to make them, will be the gain both to the cause of Biblical science and of true religion; and I, for one, must profess my deep obligations to those who, in other countries have devoted their time and labor, and in this country have hazarded worldly interests and popular favor, in this noble, though often perilous pursuit." He holds Ewald, to whom he is greatly indebted, in the highest admiration, pronouncing him "the first Biblical scholar in Europe," and referring to him in the Lectures as "the great German scholar."

We must not omit allusion to the goodly appearance of this volume, which is even superior to that of the English edition; nor to the fact so honorable to the publisher, that the American edition is "by arrangement with the author." We trust that Mr. Scribner, who is adding so rapidly to his very valuable and costly list of books, will not be without his ample remuneration.

*The Story of my Career, as Student at Freiburg and Jena, and as Professor at Halle, Breslau and Berlin; with personal reminiscences of Goethe, Schiller, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Fichte, Novalis, Schlegel, Neander, and others.* By HEINRICH STEFFENS. Translated by William Leonhard Gage. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863. 12mo., pp. 284.

STEFFENS was a Norwegian by birth, a Dane by education, having studied at the Universities of Copenhagen and of Keil, and a German by adoption. He first went to Germany when twenty-five years of age, under the patronage of the Danish Government, to prosecute his studies as a naturalist, particularly as a mineralogist. Thenceforward, with the exception of a brief residence in Copenhagen, his home was in Germany. He was there through the eventful days of the invasion by Napoleon; was on terms of intimacy with the notabilities in literature, physical science and philosophy; and, by his double fondness for metaphysical speculations and investigations in physical science, was drawn to men of the most opposite pursuits and tastes, to whom his versatility and genial vivacity made him an agreeable and welcome friend. He was not a leading spirit, nor a moulding mind of his time, though Guyot associates him with Ritter as one of the two men to whom he was indebted for his interest in the study of Physical Geography.



Mr. Gage compiled and translated this most interesting little book out of a vast mass of diluted material, covering no less than four thousand pages, and filling ten volumes. The autobiography was written after the author had become old and garrulous. The translator, and, as he should also be designated, the editor, has performed his task with rare skill. We could wish, however, that he had made use enough of the first three volumes, which he threw aside entirely, to construct a chapter on the autobiographer's early life at Copenhagen and Jena. Our knowledge of student-life in Germany is incomparably more full and accurate than it is of student-life in Denmark. But the editor is to be thanked for what we have.

*The Life and Letters of Washington Irving.* By his nephew, PIERRE M. IRVING. Vol. III. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1863.

WE lay down this volume with almost a feeling of sadness that the next must contain an account of the last illness and death of the sunny-hearted man of genius. Its pages are so instinct with his life that it is only by an effort of mind that we recall the fact that he is no longer a part of the scenes illustrated by his genius, nor of the household gladdened by his love. And it is with an almost jealous disappointment that, at the last line of the book, our engaged mind wakes from its pleasant delusion to find that this Washington Irving is not also our loving brother, uncle, and friend, and that his Peter and John, his Pierres and Sarahs, his "good little girl" Mary, and his "pebble-hearted little woman" Kate, and indeed all his, are not our own also. By the grace of his character we covet this relationship, and by the grace of his genius, we unconsciously enter into it. For it is both the necessity and the test of genius to come into such personal and universal relation. His letters, so full of graceful and vivid description and so glowing with tender home affections, are, for the time, addressed to us also. His life, so "crowded with incidents and personages, so full of shifting scenes and sudden transitions," is, while we are becoming acquainted with it, a part of our life also. We forget the skilful author and the accomplished man of letters in the warm-hearted friend and sympathetic member of our family circle. This effect so seldom found and so desirable, in biography is due, of course, in great part to the copiousness and genial frankness of Irving's correspondence. We are thus brought into direct contact with the man and under the immediate influence of his genius. Mr. Pierre Irving has, with reverent affection and in excellent taste, made of his uncle's letters almost an auto-

biography. His own contributions are simply a setting for these epistolary gems.

The present volume includes the period in Irving's literary life of the publication of his *Tour on the Prairies*, *Astoria*, *Legends of the Conquest of Spain*, *Adventures of Capt. Bonneville in the Rocky Mountains*, *Biography of Margaret Davidson*, and shorter contributions to periodical literature. It admits us to his pleasant hopes and plans in purchasing and building at Sunny Side, and to his complete enjoyment of the fulfillment of them when he at last established his home there. It also takes us with him to the Court of Spain, admits us to its gaieties and its revolutions, and then restores him and us to that beloved fire-side toward which his heart was ever yearning, and of which he had more than a year before written, "I long to be once more back at dear little Sunny Side, while I have yet strength and good spirits to enjoy the simple pleasures of the country, and to rally a happy family group once more about me. I grudge every year of absence that rolls by. To-morrow is my birthday. I shall then be sixty-two years old. The evening of life is fast drawing over me; still I hope to get back among my friends while there is yet a little sunshine left."

The history of the thirteen remaining years of his life will doubtless constitute the last volume of this most delightful biography.

*History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D., author of the "History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century." Vol. I, Geneva and France; pp. 433. Vol. II, Geneva and France; pp. 475. New York: Robt. Carter & Brothers. 1863.

THE simple announcement of a new work from the pen of D'Aubigne is all that is requisite. The present history depicts the Reformation under Calvin just as his earlier one depicted the Reformation under Luther. The two works constitute a historical plan and purpose first conceived by the author nearly a half century ago, and through the long period since steadily cherished as the chief subject of his thoughts and investigations. The two volumes before us are the ripe product of a mature old age. They close with July, 1532. Others are rapidly approaching completion.

The venerable author has written an "American Introduction" for this edition. The closing sentences, which we give, are alike creditable to the Messrs. Carter, and gratifying to all who love honorable dealing: "It is a satisfaction for an author to know that his writings will be

transmitted to a distant nation by virtue of an honorable commercial arrangement. This the author has found in his dealings with Messrs. Carter and Brothers; and he puts it to the honor of the American nation, that those editions published by the Messrs. Carter, from which alone he derives some advantage, will be purchased by the citizens of the United States, and that they will not countenance the pirated editions that other booksellers may issue without his consent." No reputable publishing house, we are confident, and we would like to add no Christian purchaser of the book, will disregard the author's wishes.

*The Rebellion Record.* A diary of American events. 1860-62.

Edited by FRANK MOORE, author of "Diary of the American Revolution." New York: G. P. Putman. Parts xxx-i-ii.

THIS serial, now well known to the public, still moves on with its cumbrous and gloomy burden. It is an invaluable thesaurus of information on all pertaining to the war.

#### SCIENCE.

*The Races of the Old World.* A manual of Ethnology. By CHAS.

L. BRACE, author of "Hungary in '51," "Home Life in Germany," "Norse Folk," etc. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

MR. BRACE has performed a most useful as well as a laborious task. The sources of the Science of Ethnology are so widely separated; and many of them so difficult of access; and even the results of the Sciences are to be found only in forms so fragmentary and scattered, that ordinary scholars of limited leisure have been compelled to remain in comparative ignorance of its principles, and of what it has actually accomplished. Mr. Brace's manual supplies at the same time a guide-book and an epitome of results. We are glad to see in the introductory chapter a vindication, brief as it is, of Language as the true basis of classification, against the untrustworthy physical tests of race so much employed by those dabblers in the Science with whom Prichard is an ultimate authority. This manual will be eagerly welcomed by a large class of readers. It "is designed, not so much for the learned, as for the large number of persons who are interested in the study of History, whether in academies and colleges, or among the people of business or professions." We hope the author will be encouraged to proceed with his projected treatise on "The Races of the New World."



*Annual of Scientific Discovery: or, Year Book of Facts in Science and Art, for 1863.* Exhibiting the most important discoveries and improvements in Mechanics, Useful Arts, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Zoölogy, Botany, Mineralogy, Meteorology, Geography, Antiquities, etc. Together with Notes on the progress of Science during the year 1862; a list of recent scientific publications; obituaries of eminent Scientific men, etc. Edited by DAVID A. WELLS, A. M., M. D., author of "Principles of Natural Philosophy," "Principles of Chemistry," "First Principles of Geology," etc., etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. London: Trubner & Co. 1863. 12mo., pp. 343.

THIS annual Summary of the results of scientific investigation has now become a universally recognized necessity. The most opposite class of readers are drawn to its pages. The characteristics of previous volumes are all preserved in this. The Notes by the editor on the progress of science, for 1862, are an admirable digest. An excellent portrait of the famous Ericsson, designer of the "Monitor" iron-clads, serves as the frontispiece.

*The Institutes of Medicine.* By MARTYN PAINE, A. M., M. D., L. L. D., Professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Materia Medica in the University of the City of New York, and corresponding member of any number of learned societies. New York: Harper & Brothers, London: Sampson Lowe, Son & Co. 1852.

DR. PAINE is one of the high authorities in his profession. The Institutes are a philosophy of Medicine based upon the theory of Vitalism, as contra-distinguished from that of mechanical and chemical physiology, and exhibit great research and rare power of analysis. In the mutability of medical science, a seventh edition is at once proof of the worth of the work, and of the estimation in which it is held by the profession.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

##### HARPERS' LIBRARY OF SELECT NOVELS.

*A Point of Honor.* By the Author of "Morals of May Fair," "Creeds," etc., etc., etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

THE story of a long and patient passion, blind and but half-requited, at last overcome by a clearer discernment of character, and displaced by a more excellent love, which gradually renovates and expands the

heart withered by its earlier fires. A quietly told story, with well defined characters, and a good moral skillfully wrought in.

*A Dark Night's Work.* By MRS. GASKELL; author of "Sylvia's Lovers," "Mary Barton," etc., etc., etc. New York: Harper & Bros. 1863.

A TALE slow in movement, wanting in plot, with little individuality of character, and, though possessing some of Mrs. Gaskell's excellencies, by no means among the best of her productions.

*St. Olaves.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

A NOVEL of very considerable merit, faulty in the details, and arbitrary in the unfolding of its plot, but elaborate and spirited in its execution.

*First Friendship.* New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

THE old young people of the present day who profess to rejoice in the *nil admirari* philosophy, and to "cut" sentiment along with their second incisors, will find, in spite of themselves, something in their hearts responsive to the romantic friendship of this story, and loyal to its old-fashioned hero, now so rarely admitted within the pale of polite fiction.

*A Manual of Flax Culture and Manufacture:* embracing directions for preparing the ground, sowing the seed, harvesting the crop, etc. Also an Essay by a Western man, on Hemp and Flax in the West; amount grown, modes of culture, preparation for market, etc. With botanical descriptions and illustrations. Rochester, N.Y. Published by D. D. T. Moore, editor of Moore's Rural New-Yorker. 1863. pamphlet. pp. 48.

THE title page of this valuable little manual sufficiently explains its contents and designs. Its publication is opportune, and will contribute to a much desired increase of flax culture in this country.

*Manual of Gymnastic Exercise for Schools and Families.* By SAMUEL W. MASON, Master of the Eliot School, Boston. Third edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols.

THANKS for whatever will help to foster the growing attention to physical culture. It is one of the hopeful signs of our time that this culture is being made a branch of public education. This little manual of exercise has the merit of embodying a system which has been practically tested, and which ordinary school teachers may readily adopt.

*Theory and Art of Penmanship.* A manual for Teachers, containing a full statement of Payson, Dunton and Scribner's celebrated method of teaching, including class-drill, writing in concert, criticism and correction of errors, hints towards awakening interest, etc. Together with a complete analysis and synthesis of script letters, as developed in their series of writing books. By Messrs. PAYSON, DUNTON, SCRIBNER, and HAYES. Second edition. Boston: Crosby & Nichols. New York: O. S. Fell. 1853.

THIS is a manual which we should suppose teachers of chirographic mysteries would find instructive to themselves, and helpful to their pupils. It contains the combined wisdom of four celebrated masters of the art.

*Tales and Sketches.* By HUGH MILLER, author of "The Old Red Sandstone," etc., etc. Edited, with a Preface, by Mrs. MILLER. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1863.

It is generally a species of questionable kindness to the memory of an author to collect and republish his earlier and fugitive productions. Though the reputation of Hugh Miller will suffer nothing from these volumes, yet it will be difficult, from the merit of the tales themselves, to make out, to all minds, a very clear justification of this attempt to rescue them from oblivion.

*Modern War: Its Theory and Practice.* Illustrated from celebrated campaigns and battles; with plans and diagrams. By EMERIC SZABAD, U. S. A. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863. 12mo. pp. 284.

CAPTAIN SZABAD left the Italian service for the double purpose of participating in the American War, and of afterwards describing its events. He was attached to the army of General Fremont in Western Virginia, and when operations in that quarter and under that officer ceased, he was temporarily thrown out of active service. His leisure was occupied in preparing this popular exposition of the modern theory of the art of war. He touches upon the progress of the art; describes an army, its "secondary operations," its lesser engagements or "combats," its marches and manœuvres; explains and illustrates plans of campaigns and sundry noted battles in modern warfare, concluding with a chapter on retreats. Its explanations and illustrations by diagrams will make more intelligible to the uninitiated the accounts of our own great battles.



*Holy Land, with Glimpses of Europe and Egypt : A Year's Tour.*

By S. DRYDEN PHELPS, D. D. Twenty-two engravings. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1863. 12mo., pp. 407.

DR. PHELPS has been fortunate in his time of publication ; the disadvantage of expensiveness has been more than compensated by the total absence of competition from any other recent book of travels ; and the pre-occupation of the public mind by national affairs has not been so complete as to exclude a demand for the more valuable kind of new books. Nor is Dr. Phelps' book without its value. It does not profess to contribute materially to the knowledge we already have of the countries he has described, and indeed it must be rapid sketching which can bring Europe, Egypt and the Holy Land within 407 duodecimo pages. His aim is simply to take us along with him in a free and easy way through his year of sight-seeing, telling us what he sees and how he feels, and making the journey as agreeable to us as possible. There are certain stock epithets in his descriptions, such as "fine," "interesting," etc., which occur with unpleasant frequency ; and occasionally a page is marred by an infelicity or inaccuracy of phrase, which a little attention would have readily detected, and which interferes with an otherwise agreeable impression.

*Paris in America.* By DR. RENÉ LEFEBVRE (Edouard Laboulaye),  
Translated by MARY L. BOOTH. New York: Charles Scribner.  
1863.

M. LABOULAYE is a native Parisian, about fifty-two years of age, and by profession a lawyer. He is also an industrious author. His earlier works pertained mostly to the law ; those written in later life cover a somewhat wider field of inquiry ; the themes of several have been drawn from our own country. He is known to Americans in Paris as a warm admirer of our free institutions, the operations of which as well as of our "peculiar institution" he has for a long time closely watched and studied. Miss Booth informs us that his lectures this year in the *Collège de France*, on the American Revolution, have elicited the highest applause.

The fanciful form into which he has cast his thoughts in the present work, has furnished opportunity for exhibiting the various peculiarities of our republican customs, religious, domestic, social and political, and contrasting them with those of his own country. He supposes himself, his family and his entire street to be transported by magnetism across the seas to America, where he finds his wife, children and neigh-

bors thoroughly nationalized, and only himself retaining his French notions, or any memory of France at all. His old principles and prejudices, after a great deal of protest and argument which furnish opportunity for the dealing of much lively satire, gradually give way, and he also becomes a thorough republican. This happy result accomplished, the astonished convert finds himself seized by the hair of his head and in this unexampled manner again conveyed across the ocean to his Parisian bed-chamber, where, like many another good republican, he wakes to find himself wept over as a lunatic. His friends listen in amazement and horror to his monstrous heresies, and sagely concluding that he is too dangerous to be left at large, consign him and his republicanism to the safe and more congenial auditory of a mad-house.

M. Laboulaye, as a recognized authority on American matters, cannot fail to enlighten his countrymen on the practical workings of our social and political machinery, while, notwithstanding its exaggerations, his little work has, in the present conflict of opinions, its lessons for ourselves also.

---

#### FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

---

The Church question, it is well known, has recently awakened great interest in Germany. Among the writers who have expressed their views with effect on this topic is Prof. *Rothe*, of Heidelberg. In the *Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1862, (1st and 2nd Hefte), are two elaborate articles from his pen, from which we make a few extracts. In the following passage he sets forth his idea of the church at least negatively:

“For me the Christian Church, according to *its very idea*, is incapable of perfection. As I understand its nature, this very nature determines that it neither *can* nor *should* be perfectly realized, because to me the church is a form of fellowship essentially inadequate to Christianity, or, more accurately, to the Christian community. A perfect Christian Church is for me an inner contradiction, and of course the same is

true of a perfect church constitution. If then a particular church organization, which is adjusted to the *idea* of the church, is found to embrace serious defects, these defects are in themselves, for me, no proof that it is not right—that it is not, from the Christian stand-point, the best possible in the circumstances, and therefore the one which is required by the will of God. After clothing itself for the first or catholic period in a churchly or exclusively religious form, Christianity in the present period of its history is translating itself from that form into the *civil* or *religio-ethical* form. This is the essential character of the period, and in it I can have no thought of shaping to perfection a church as such; nay, it must seem *to me* folly for any man to make the attempt. I am also thoroughly persuaded that the result of such an attempt, if seriously carried out, would be no other than a return to Catholicism by the shortest way. . . . Admitting, then, that our new ecclesiastical constitution in Baden has many defects, *when tested by the pure idea of the church*, I hold most decidedly these defects to be excellencies—*essential excellencies*—because I have no concern for the church as such, but only as *promotive of Christianity*, and I am convinced that Christianity, in the present stage of its historical development and activity, can only use an *imperfect* church as a means appropriate to its ends, and in a perfect church it would find a positive hindrance to its development and activity.”

Again, speaking of creeds, he says:—“Certain views and representations, and indeed just those which in the system of our old churchly Christianity support the whole doctrinal structure, are for the advanced modern consciousness irrecoverably lost. To restrict myself to the cardinal points, it is flatly impossible, (and in quiet reflection I rejoice at the fact), that in the period of the development of Christianity on which we have just entered the old ecclesiastical representation of the Holy Scriptures and their Inspiration, the Athanasian or any other doctrine of a real Trinity, the Chalcedonian doctrine of the Person of Christ, the Anselmian or any other juridical doctrine of the Atonement, the doctrine of any magical working of the Sacrament, and the like, should ever again become the honest conviction of the cultivated generally.”

When so eminent a scholar and so winning a man as Professor Rothe—the Melancthon of German rationalists—gives expression to such views, it is gratifying to know that he does not carry with him the assent of the great body of German theologians. His views are rejected without hesitation by multitudes who, not many decades ago,



would have welcomed them with applause. At present the tendency is but too strong towards church orthodoxy and authority. The signs of the times would be more hopeful, if those who accept the Scriptures as an authoritative revelation of God's will, were to insist more earnestly upon their teaching, and pay less deference to the voice of the church. The following extracts will reveal in some measure the heart of Rothe and his deep consciousness of the widening gulf which separates him from the great body of evangelical believers in Germany:

"My opponents, when they attempt to set me right, are in the habit of speaking of gifts which I am supposed to possess, and of allowing my personal piety to be genuine and even Christian. I give them true and hearty thanks, (for it is not to me a matter of indifference whether they still leave a tie unbroken between us), although I must judge of myself very differently and find myself only a man who has been and is nothing more than this, that by God's grace (he knows not how) he possesses an eye and a heart with which he can see and lay hold of his Savior, and, in that Saviour's face and heart, of God; and that, besides, he finds himself, to his heart-humbling rapture, in a world from which, rising far above the sharp cry of sin and sorrow, and through all their discords, a thousand tongued chorus of lowly jubilant voices to the praise and glory of their Creator and their Saviour, in even new and fuller tones from day to day, is sounding in his ear."

We had thought of transcribing his definition of faith in Christ, but the passage is so long that we forbear.

The lectures of the late Professor Bleek of Bonn, have been in course of publication for the last two or three years. An *Introduction to the Old Testament*; another to the *New*; an *Exposition of the Synoptical Gospels*, and *Lectures on the Apocalypse*, have already appeared. His theological position was that of a moderate rationalist. In extent and accuracy of scholarship, in perspicuity of style, and in simplicity of character he had few superiors. His commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews has been for a long time in the hands of scholars, and the works named above will be found to exhibit the same theological opinions and principles of interpretation and carefulness of research, which distinguish that commentary.

In his *Introduction to the New Testament* he offers the following remarks on Miracles: "(a) Formerly the idea of a miracle was for the most part too rigidly and absolutely defined, as an event wrought directly against the laws of nature; and in general I perfectly agree with the representation that has of late become prevalent, especially through

the influence of Schleiermacher, that miracles are but relatively supernatural events, not contravening the laws ordained by God, but produced by a secret and rare co-operation of laws different from, and higher than, those presented to the common view. (b) The miracles of Christ are in general to be regarded as wrought by the influence of the Spirit of God upon nature—the spirit of God dwelling fully in Him. (c) We must not, however, be careful about determining *a priori* how far this influence may reach, not merely on living human nature, but also on the lifeless; and one who supposes that he can decide beforehand, without studying the character of the miracles, properly authenticated before him, what kinds are possible, is only self-deceived. Hence the miracles of the fourth gospel cannot be rejected on the ground that some of them transcend the province of miraculous agency.”

In the introduction to his Exposition of the Synoptical Gospels he says: “Among the Synoptical Gospels that of Mark stands a step lower, as a fountain for the history of the life of Jesus, than the two others, in which we still possess the principal sources of Mark. As a special historical witness Mark appears only in a few narratives, peculiar to himself, and in certain additions to those given by Matthew and Luke, some of which are very interesting. But his gospel is exceedingly important as a witness for the other two gospels, as a proof that already in his time these two must have had a certain authority in the church as trustworthy records of the life of our Lord; since otherwise, Mark would not have founded his work chiefly, and indeed almost exclusively, on those two writings.”

Without assenting to the views contained in these extracts, we give the former to illustrate the moderate rationalism of Prof. Bleek and the latter to show his opinion on a difficult point of criticism.

The lectures of Prof. Bleek on the Apocalypse may be classed with the works of Lücke, De Wette, Ewald and Duesterdick on the same book. But in the “*Commentary on the Revelation of John*,” by Prof. Volkman of Zurich, (1862), we have an exposition by a disciple of Baur; and the disciple goes beyond his master. For while Baur admitted the genuineness of the Apocalypse as a work of the Apostle John, Volkman ascribes it, without hesitation, to some writer who concealed his own name and assumed that of the beloved disciple. He therefore proclaims all the New Testament writings to be spurious, with the exception of four epistles of Paul. We wait for the last stroke, and expect that ere long the remaining pillars of historical Christianity will be prostrated (in imagination) by this doughty assailant.